

The Judæans



CS
102
J8
v. 3

CP 1912

Property of
AMBASSADOR COLLEGE LIBRARY
Pasadena, California

Judæan Addresses

SELECTED

VOL. III



1918-1926

PUBLISHED BY

“THE JUDÆANS”

IN COMMEMORATION OF THEIR THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY

NEW YORK

BLOCH PUBLISHING COMPANY

“The Jewish Book Concern”

1927

25
102
11
4-3



DEC
18
1983

40/0

2

PREFACE

THE publication of this volume synchronizes with the thirtieth anniversary of the Society's foundation. It contains selections of addresses delivered and papers read since the close of the period covered by Volume II. If space and circumstances had permitted, the Society would have preferred making this volume a complete record of such addresses and papers. In many cases, however, no stenographic notes were taken, and the speakers had not prepared comprehensive notes or copies of their discourses. In other cases, inclusion in this volume would have been duplicative of other permanent publications by other Societies. In all cases, the rule governing the preparation of Vol. II., excluding matter of purely local or temporary interest, has been adhered to. The book, however, contains a complete list of the Society's meetings for the period covered, with the titles of discourses delivered and the names of speakers. There is also added the Constitution and lists of officers and members of the Society.

JULIUS J. FRANK, *Chairman.*

LEWIS M. ISAACS,

MAX J. KOHLER,

SAMSON LACHMAN (*ex officio*)

Committee on Publication

New York, January, 1927.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	3
LEIPZIGER MEMORIAL EXERCISES	
<i>Addresses by:</i>	
HON. SAMSON LACHMAN	9
HON. HERBERT L. BRIDGMAN	11
REV. DR. STEPHEN S. WISE.....	13
JOSEPH L. BUTTENWIESER	16
DR. GEORGE F. KUNZ	19
HON. LOUIS MARSHALL	21
PROF. THEODORE REINACH: "The Essence of Judaism".....	25
MEETING IN HONOR OF THE EARL OF READING, LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF ENGLAND AND SPECIAL BRITISH ENVOY TO THE UNITED STATES	
<i>Addresses by:</i>	
HON. SAMSON LACHMAN	33
JULIUS J. FRANK	35
JACOB H. SCHIFF	38
HON. ABRAM I. ELKUS	40
REV. DR. STEPHEN S. WISE	42
THE EARL OF READING	46
DAVID M. BRESSLER: "American Jewish War Relief Abroad".....	54
DR. FELIX PERLES: "Biblical Criticism and Jewish Science".....	60
PROF. ISMAR ELBOGEN: "Attitude of the Last Twenty Years and Pres- ent Conditions of Jewish Learning"	68
DR. ISRAEL ABRAHAMS: "Leisure"	74
DR. KAUFMANN KOHLER: "The Lesson from Tutankh-Amon's Tomb for the Jew"	81
ISRAEL ZANGWILL MEETING	
<i>Addresses by:</i>	
HON. SAMSON LACHMAN	88
ISRAEL ZANGWILL	89, 124
HON. LOUIS MARSHALL	109
HON. HORACE STERN	112
SIMEON STRUNSKY	119

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PROF. LUDWIG STEIN: "The Crisis of European Civilization" (Noelting and Spengler)	126
PROF. JULIUS GOLDSTEIN: "Race Theory and Anti-Semitism".....	144
MAX J. KOHLER: "Immigration and Racial Discrimination".....	146
JAMES N. ROSENBERG: "The Jewish Colonization Work in Russia".....	164
THE WORLD COURT AND THE PROTECTION OF RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS MINORITIES	
<i>Addresses by:</i>	
HON. SAMSON LACHMAN	168
HON. LOUIS MARSHALL	169
PROF. MANLEY O. HUDSON	182
DR. ARTHUR K. KUHN	196
JUDAEAN MEETINGS, 1918-1926	203
CONSTITUTION	207
LIST OF OFFICERS.....	210
LIST OF MEMBERS.....	211

The Judæans

HENRY M. LEIPZIGER MEMORIAL MEETING*

ADDRESS BY HON. SAMSON LACHMAN, *Chairman*

ON December 1st, the long struggle for life of our friend Dr. Leipziger, which had continued from youth to old age, was ended. In anticipation of a more permanent memorial by a grateful community, the Judaeon Society, of which he had been president from the time of its inception over 20 years ago, and whose success he had so much at heart, has thought it appropriate to assemble a few of the organizations and associations to which he contributed his thought, his energy and his untiring efforts in a life of many-sided activities, to give expression to our respect for his memory, our appreciation of his endeavors and his successes, our admiration of his indomitable zeal for justice and truth.

He was trained in our Public Schools and our City College, and in his lifetime of work in various fields, in the lecture, library, vocational and industrial training fields, he ever worked with the public school spirit as a solid foundation. He never lost his love for a real democracy, and his record was a battle, a continual battle, for the spiritual and the ideal; a war against ignorance, indifference and brutality; a fight for the higher things of life.

As far back as the early days of the Young Men's Hebrew Association, he commenced his communal and his literary efforts. There are many of us here who remember his debates of those days; his readings from the standard authors; his appreciation of the humorous and rhythmic. He was a born orator. His voice was sympathetic and ever responded to the call for the right and leading in the tumultuous affairs of his genera-

* Held at Temple Emanu-el Vestry Room, Feb. 26, 1918.

* Addresses of this meeting are printed from stenographic reports, not revised by the speakers.

tion. I can recall him seated on this platform, leading the Bible studies of the religious classes of this Temple; also when lecturing to thousands on the life history of Benjamin Franklin and Abraham Lincoln. He was ever pleading for justice to humanity at large public gatherings, or delivering lectures on the common weal, and when, at the end of each year, he reported to an enthusiastic and loving audience the results of the Forum, the value of the work done by the City Lecture groups during the year, and when from time to time we, the Judæans, were favored by a little classic cameo at the opening of our meetings, and the introduction of our guests—in all of these he was equally charming, powerful and delightful.

He was an enthusiastic lover of good music; he reveled in the delights of the opera and the theatre. Travel appealed to him as to few others. He was an indefatigable reader, and he ever kept pace with the onward movement of his time. His great anxiety was to spread the benefit of these intellectual delights among the people; to pass these gifts on in the utmost measure. Physically frail, he had only his mind, his spirit and his conscience to accomplish the wonders, to achieve the name, which he wrought for himself. He was a great executive officer. Those who were associated with him in the conduct of the Aguilar Free Library know how practical and systematic he was in his administration; and his successful leadership of the City Lecture Course, a department which flourished in the face of all difficulties, financial and administrative, and in spite of the severest attacks upon his perseverance and strength, testifies to the soundness and the genuineness of his business methods.

We have heard him likened to Thomas Carlyle. True, we heard many complaints at his hands, but he didn't stop there. His work was constructive, and he was ever seeking a remedy for the evils which burdened and oppressed his spirit.

His love for his home was unbounded. Those who were fortunate enough to meet him there, saw him freed from the surroundings of the outer world, with that merry twinkle in his eye, which belied his spoken irony, simple and child-like in his devotion to his family, and in the recreation of his friendships.

My duties as presiding officer come to me tonight, as a member of the committee of the Judaeans which had in hand the arrangement of this memorial, and I do not wish to infringe upon the time or themes of our distinguished guests; but I could not forbear expressing my personal grief, my personal affection, for Dr. Leipziger, and my profound regard for his memory.

ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT L. BRIDGMAN

Member of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York

It is fitting that the words which I shall try to pass to you this evening shall be few and simple.

The Lecturers shortly after the death of our leader, adopted this Minute:

“For more than a quarter of a century Dr. Leipziger inspired and guided this educational evangelism. Words are inadequate to measure the value of his service to all the people, or to express our admiration for his untiring effort and undaunted faith. He has enlarged the vision and developed the mental power and moral worth of every member of the community. To him education was a means, not an end, and he welcomed every agency and influence which would lead on to higher life and better citizenship. Truth, the truth which makes men free, was his ideal and inspiration, and in his quest every department of knowledge, every form of art, was included. Keen sympathy, child of experience, varied and vitalized his thoughts and plans for the betterment of his fellowmen, and sincerity rang in every word and act. Educators in many and distant States recognized his work and its worth, while New York, if she would see his monument, has but to look around upon millions of lives raised from barren levels and set forward on those of wholesome self-respect and noble aspiration. We are too near him and the end of his active service ade-

quately to estimate its worth or definitely to predict its future. Mindful, however, of his example, we pledge ourselves to cherish his memory and, quickened by it, carry on, as far as in us lies, the work for which he gave his life."

I might very well end there, but still there is something a little more personal, a little more intimate to be said, because not only was it my pleasure, my honor, to serve under this noble leader, but strong friendship, running through many years, had grown up between us, and I mourn for him as one mourns for a friend and leader.

Now how did this all come about, this wonderful University of the People, built without a structure, that is being seen far and wide, is admired by every State in the Union? It was due to that wonderful personality, that combination of qualities, of which the chairman has so effectively spoken, a personality which seemed to infuse itself into every lecturer, so that all of us felt that we had a mission, that we were not only led, one might say, but we were inspired; we had a message to deliver; something more than mere words or mere information, or mere intelligence, of the colors of music, or accounts of travels, or whatever it may be; it went into the hearts and the lives of the people, and it was our business to see that we could through something carry out that spirit which was behind us, that spirit which animated the whole work in which we were engaged.

Dr. Leipziger was a very thorough disciplinarian, and we all found that we were thereby a great deal better off, for we all came to love him and to respect him, and everyone of the lecture corps knew that he was only asked to bear his just part, and to do what he had to do, to the best of his ability.

I think the Doctor was a mystic. He must have had a spiritual vision. He told me once he believed in the theory of another world, and you could not help seeing, when you came in contact with him, that he was sincerely, consciously and intelligently acting upon that theory or philosophy; and he had that inspiration, just as other men have ambition for things that we sometimes get in this life.

We have lost a great friend and a great leader; a prophet and seer that pointed to the vision before us; and I think, and I make no claims to prophecy, that this legacy which he has left will never be forgotten.

There is one other thing to which I must refer—the intense Americanism of Dr. Leipziger. In the early years, when the first symptoms of trouble came, the American idea, the American position and the American principles were placed to the front in every lecture center and emphasized with all the force and power that Dr. Leipziger could command; and when the later events came, when the struggle came along, then there was no question at all that there had not been in any school in America anywhere more enthusiastic, more inspiring, talks than these lecture circuits.

So I can say, we mourn for him and shall honor his memory as prophet, educator and great American.

So far as the State Department of Education is concerned, they too recognize, as well as we do, who served with him, the value of the services, the magnitude of the work and the merit of the life that is ended, and they will participate at the proper time, in the proper way in paying respects and honor to his memory.

ADDRESS BY REV. DR. STEPHEN S. WISE

IT IS good to note the simple, intimate, tone which this meeting is inevitably taking. It enables one to speak as one could wish, as one of Leipziger's friends, to others among his friends.

About ten years ago, William James of Harvard, writing on the death of a man, who in some ways, in some not insignificant ways, reminded one of Leipziger, said that Thomas Davidson was one of those men who somehow did not seem to fit into the customary grooves of life. None of us, who knew Davidson,—and I take it all of us did,—but felt with James that it was something of a tragedy that Davidson, inspirer of men, emancipator of youth, in a very high sense of the term, could never be fitted

into any particular place, within or without a university. In a sense it is true of Henry Leipziger that he had to make his own way. Like Davidson he had to create his own place, and creating it, fitted. There was no ready-made niche for him to occupy. He was so outstanding; he was truly, to use the much abused term, a unique personality. He had to hew out his way.

As I think of Henry Leipziger, and I knew him more than 30 years, I recall having heard him for the first time when he was a young man and I was a youth, in this building. Some of you may recall the circumstance, memorable in the history of education and advance, when a plea was made to the Jews of New York on behalf of that work that he was to create, namely the work of the Hebrew Technical Institute. Two figures stand out, the figure of that great American, Carl Schurz, and the figure of Leipziger himself, young, yet never quite youthful, full of deep, passionate and most unrestrained enthusiasm. I see, as I think back upon Henry Leipziger, you and I can find the reasons that made it so difficult for him to fit himself into the customary place of our social order.

For one thing, Henry Leipziger was an "enthusiast." How many men really are enthusiasts? Mr. Bridgman hinted a moment ago, at the secret of Leipziger's life, and I know his intention was to say "Genius." Remember how he pointed out the literal meaning of enthusiast: "And in him was God." He had a vision. He was a man of God. I think of him as a man, of whom we may have truly said, "And I shall fill him with the spirit of God." Of Leipziger it may be said that he recast the whole of his own life so as to fit the place others chose for him, for he suffered himself to be that unusual being, "A man of God, a man who sees God, a man who walks with God, a man who according to his light worked and wrought with God." For yet another reason Leipziger's way was higher; it was hard in some respects. He was not a soothsayer. He was a man who did not tell merely felicitous tales; he was stern and terrible in his wrath, and of him it might be said, "Thou speakest peace, peace, where there is no peace." He could never have fumbled in his style to speak peace when there was no peace,

when he knew there ought to have been war. There was something almost majestic in the wrath with which this physically broken, but spiritually indomitable, man could pit himself against any wrong, any injustice, yes, even any unwisdom which he felt that it was his mission to right, to rectify. Again, Henry Leipziger was a teacher, but he was that rare being among teachers, a pioneer.

Now Leipziger created two places for himself in the world, and each of them was the place of a pioneer. Three hundred years ago, one of the greatest Englishmen had said that education must train the mind of the citizen, and we all read the words of John Milton, and promptly proceeded to forget their real meaning. Leipziger never forgot. Leipziger became a teacher of the people, and a democrat, a teacher of democracy to the people. Leipziger dared to be a pioneer in that, years and years before the rest of us, he understood the genuineness of democracy. He cried out that to every man should be given the opportunity to fit and enrich himself in time to aid in attacking the tasks of life. Then, last of all, Henry Leipziger's way was not easy; it was stormy; sometimes, as one looked upon him, he was nothing less than tragic, because Leipziger was not merely the things that we have pointed out, but he was a being who knew not the art of living in facile pleasing fashion by the side of man. If Leipziger had learned the gentle art of compromise and equivocation, he would have been less of a prophet; less of a seer; his ways would have been gentler; there would have been less of storm and stress in his life. Thank God that he never learned how to compromise. I thank God that he never learned the art of equivocation.

I happen to recall a festive day in the life of our people. It is Purim Day. Purim means just one thing. That there lived one man,—a man by the way whose name forms a part of Leipziger's, of whom it is said "He would not bow down nor do reverence to Haman." Leipziger would not bow down nor do reverence to any man,—though that man were king. Such was the inspiring force of his upright life; but if there was sternness in his life, it was because he was of that limited company of

men who will not compromise, who will not equivocate, who will be heard, and heard he was.

I say one word to the Judaeans to-night, we can speak it now, but do you realize what the Judaeans meant to him; what the Judaeans were in his sight? The Judaeans for 10, yea for 20 years, constituted Leipziger's one point of contact with Jewish life. Leipziger would practically have been lost to Jewish life as far as his resplendent gifts of inspiration are concerned. He might have been lost to Jewish life, but the Judaeans came; they gave him a Jewish platform; they gave him a Jewish foothold. In the company of the Judaeans, he found himself, and was happy to see his Jewish soul re-awakened, but it had never set, and the Judaeans offered to this man comradeship and refuge. The Judaeans were wise enough to capitalize the moral gifts and the spiritual genius of Leipziger. When Leipziger died, I wrote of him to a friend in terms that you will recall: Leipziger was a soldier in the liberation war of humanity,—and a soldier undaunted and unwearable. Intellectually he was an emancipator; educationally he was a liberator. This knightly, stern, sombre figure was a light-bringer. He was torch and torch-bearer, and for every memory of this dynamic, radiant being, we are very grateful.

ADDRESS BY JOSEPH L. BUTTENWIESER

THE Hebrew Technical Institute is indeed happy to be among those who were invited, and who, in fact, suggested this memorial meeting to the honor of Henry M. Leipziger.

Henry M. Leipziger has erected a monument more lasting than any of his friends could possibly furnish. And why is it? Because of the added reverence to the one that has gone, because the human mind loves to worship memories. Dr. Leipziger was a finer hero than any who fight in the war that is now upon the world. Henry Leipziger did not steal the fire from heaven to destroy. Henry Leipziger took the fire from heaven to which Dr. Wise so beautifully referred, in order to spread light and

hope wherever he went. While others are inventing instruments that shall destroy the work of civilization, that the thousands of years had reared, this man in the brief span of one lifetime has reared two temples that shall stand long after we here shall have passed away. If he had done but one, if he had done but one thing, to help to found the Hebrew Technical Institute,—and Dr. Wise was old enough or young enough if you wish, to be present when that scheme was first thought of,—I too think that in that brief time Leipziger had been the fore-runner of a movement that had grown so great that all the United States are clamoring for more and more of the light that he had given!

Dr. Wise has said that he fitted into no niche. I claim he has fitted into any and every niche into which he was put, but like all geniuses, he could not stay in the niche into which he was put, for he turned around it a brilliancy and a power that was astounding.

After all, what was it in Leipziger that made him such a force in the community? Leipziger, throughout his life demonstrated what genius coupled with indomitable energy could accomplish. Mr. Bridgman said that he was more of a mystic, somewhat of a prophet. He was all that. He was indeed a prophet in Israel in this very generation in which he lived, for what is a prophet? One who brings a message of hope to mankind, that shall bring to us useful comfort and health for all time; and Leipziger spoke from the heights, and Leipziger's message pervaded the homes of the community.

When he took hold of our infant institution, and had overcome the prejudice of those who thought that manual labor perchance was not as dignified as mental labor, it took energy, it took perseverance; and Leipziger made it a living force. Then, when there came a thought of an evening lecture course, it was Leipziger who breathed into it that spirit of high idealism that made of it what it has been called, a University of the People. Not only to the thousands and tens of thousands of contributors who thereby became better citizens, nobler men and women, with higher ideals, it likewise became a light for other institutions in other cities.

If you stop to think of the man with frail frame like Leipziger, who despite physical ailments, fought onward and onward, by dint of a soul that was kindled with a divine spirit itself, you will then know why Leipziger could fit into any groove, out of which he so quickly grew.

It has been referred to by Dr. Wise, that Leipziger did not thoroughly fit into the social life of the community. Leipziger did fit in, but the work of a missionary, of the prophet, of the priest, in any community, is always one that is fraught with a little danger. The man who from the housetops speaks against the evils of the day, as did the prophets of old, is always apt to find that the community at large fails to see the sunlight, but notes only the spots on the sun. It is therefore natural, not pardonable, but natural, that so many may criticize, even though somewhat admiring. So then we are apt to withhold from the unselfish worker our expression of appreciation of his service until after his death, when it is no longer of any value to him.

There is but one Plato among a thousand smaller men, looking up to him, who have been lifted up to his level. Only one Dante, yet a thousand singers of a tune that delights us all; only one Ridgeway under whom a thousand lesser artists have been elevated to his level; only one Florence Nightingale who placed her life upon the altar of living service, and how many thousands of noble women taking inspiration from her have been willing to place their lives upon the altar of service? Only one Leipziger in this great community of ours, a teacher in the highest sense of the word, a teacher of teachers, and how many thousands drawing inspiration, as Mr. Bridgeman has said, from the example that he gave them to become better, finer, and more God-fearing, and inspired and inspiring teachers.

The last utterance I heard from Henry M. Leipziger was a short address at a gathering to consider education in this community. I sat upon his bed of sickness the last time I spoke to him. It was the finest address I ever heard. And it showed above all why he succeeded in everything he ever did, and that fine and ideal conception of what a teacher he was. He made the teaching profession something better, something higher, be-

cause he had devoted his life to it, and if we are to be true to the memory of Henry M. Leipziger, if we are to solve the question that perplexes us and has perplexed this great community, as to how to make our public school system better, let us learn from his life to dignify the calling, which, after all, is the highest and holiest profession to which man can look, not even excepting the ministry itself, for the destiny and the duty of a teacher is that of a minister to help to mould the human soul to high and noble usefulness.

It is a God-given privilege of the inspired teacher to help to instill into the mind of youth, high and beautiful thoughts, into his soul, abiding faith, and into his heart, undying love, and if we are to gather any benefit from these memorial services, if we are to honor the memory of Henry M. Leipziger, we can do no better than in helping to do anything that will make the calling of the teacher more profitable, by helping to give it that respect which it deserves, and the reward that can be given to any good life. The teacher, like the minister and the altruistic physician, cannot get, and never will receive, the primary reward commensurate with their enormous work, but we can give them that which is worth more than money, that esteem and regard and reverence to which their divine calling is entitled.

We can do no better than pay our friend the tribute of taking him for an example to be imitated.

* * *

Prof. Charles P. Fagnani also delivered an appropriate address which has not been preserved, which dealt particularly with Henry M. Leipziger as one of the most distinguished alumni of the College of the City of New York.

ADDRESS BY DR. GEORGE F. KUNZ

THE members of the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society have selected me, their President, to represent them at this memorial meeting, most fittingly held in honor of our

esteemed friend and fellow trustee, the late Dr. Henry M. Leipziger, and to say a few words about his work in connection with our organization, and give expression to the high regard in which we have held him.

Dr. Leipziger sat often in our councils in the past fifteen years. He was ever alert, helpful, suggestive, clear in his judgment, ready to plead his views, willing to yield when others had more convincing arguments or compelling facts. As a Trustee he rendered great service, especially in matters affecting civic conditions, and when subjects pertaining to the City's Fourth of July celebrations, and other patriotic demonstrations were under consideration, at which time his knowledge of the people and his connection with the schools made his assistance invaluable. He faithfully served on the Letchworth Park Committee of our Society, that committee which has in its charge one of the finest of the parks of the Empire State. We have often reaped the benefit of his willing advice and we shall greatly miss his counsel in the future. He gave one confidence in all that he said—there was nothing furtive about him. First he desired all the facts; then he thought them over; and in a short time he was ready with an earnest, unbiased opinion. We who knew him personally miss his kindly interest, for he had an appealing and lovable nature and attracted many to him by the direct clear tones of his voice and the gentle, but firm expression of his eye.

His monument, the Public School Lecture Course, founded by Dr. Leipziger under the auspices of the New York "World" and then assumed by the City of New York, has been and will be one of the greatest educating forces in our great metropolis. These lectures are not only a valuable means of education—especially to those who toil by day and even though weary, search for knowledge and truth at night, but they aid in bringing those who have a message to deliver and information to impart, into direct contact with the general public; and they find in their audiences, most willing and receptive listeners, and meet with none of that listlessness so often present when students go to

learn, because they are sent, and not because it is their interest and desire.

Among thousands that we meet, one rises above his surroundings, like a great oak standing out for some marked characteristics, unusual personality, forcefulness of manner, singleness of purpose, unselfishness of motive and withal actuated by a desire to help his fellow-man, irrespective of politics or creed. Such a man was Henry M. Leipziger. He rendered a great service to his city and his country, in higher education making education more accessible, and in the preservation of history and of scenery.

Dr. Leipziger was progressive. To the last day he was never old in spirit. He was ever ready to grasp anything that was new. He knew the sentiment of the masses. He was not a man that stood by and held back education, or what the people wanted, and he always knew what was better for them. He kept up with the trend of the times. He stopped at nothing to better the lecture courses. All he cared for was to have the lecture course always interesting, always changing, and he brought education to the people in a way in which it was never brought out before.

ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS MARSHALL

To do justice to Dr. Leipziger's memory, to his useful and laborious life, to what he has accomplished in this community, would require time and thought and study, more than anyone, who is engaged in too many occupations, is capable of giving to so great a subject. It is well therefore that what I have to say will be largely reminiscent, largely personal,—referring to his activities in the Educational Alliance and in this Congregation.

I had the honor and the pleasure to become acquainted with him shortly after I came to this city some 24 years ago, and soon thereafter to become associated with him on the Board of Directors of the Educational Alliance, and it was given to me to con-

sider, study and emulate his great virtue, so far as it was possible for anyone else to do so.

In the Educational Alliance he indicated the possession of the qualities of a great teacher. He indicated the possession of a quality which is too rare, of a man who was not satisfied with existing conditions. He never was one of those who considered that which he did, or that in which he was engaged, as the perfection of human wisdom. He had a real and definite dissatisfaction, which was one of his great powers and resources and reservoirs of strength and force. It is so easy to let matters drift; to say: this is being done, that is all right; there is no use of doing more. It was very rare in his case to find that he was at all satisfied, and so long as he was able to give his thought and attention to the work of the Educational Alliance, it was always apparent where our short-comings were, he called attention to them, and not in terms of compliments. He was not one of those who loved to utter a pleasing word, where a word of criticism or even harsh criticism was necessary. It shook one out of a sense of contentment. And I frequently had occasion to observe the soundness of his criticism. An attribute which he possessed was that, although he did not, or was unable to, attend all the meetings, he was able to project himself into existing situations. He had the power of imagination; he had the intuitions of a woman and the vigor of a man. His influence in the Educational Alliance is felt to this day, and it would have been well, had it been possible for him to have continued through all the years to be as active as I knew he desired to be, in the work of that institution, which has upon it the impress of his personality and of his great character.

I greatly appreciate the fine psychological analysis of the Jew that was presented to us this evening by Dr. Fagnani. It was not because he painted the Jew in terms of appreciation and sympathy. I am very glad that he was not one of those who bestowed compliments upon the Jew as an individual. But he understands the soul of Judaism; the soul of the Jew of the Bible, and the soul of the Jew of the prophets, and it is because of that appreciation that he was able to view Dr. Leipziger from

that point of vantage which is essential to a thorough understanding of our departed friend. He was truly the spiritual heir of the prophets. Lost to Judaism? It would have been absolutely impossible for him to have been lost to Judaism, because he was the incarnation of the Jewish spirit.

I had occasion to observe that phase of this great man, in the work which he did in the Congregation Emanu-El. From 1895 to 1899 he was the leader of the Post-Graduate Class of our religious school. That is a tribute to his greatness; to his power to inspire others. Those classes did not consist merely of the recent graduates of the religious school, but for four years, his class-room was crowded to overflowing by adult members of the congregation, by those of other congregations, by people who understood him, and who came to hear and to learn.

I was at that time one of the members of the Religious School Committee, and I confess that I performed my duty in the religious school inadequately, because I sat at his feet to learn, and was faithful in my attendance in his classes. He was inspiration to everybody who came in contact with him, and although he was a young man, and had never studied for the ministry, had not pursued the study of the Talmud, had not engaged in theological investigation or research, it was marvelous to note the vastness of his knowledge, the keenness of his perception, the thoroughness of his thought, so that, when it was required to have assistance in the pulpit of Temple Emanu-El, he was requested in the Fall of 1901 to deliver a course of ten lay sermons before this Congregation. They were well attended by a discriminating audience. It is regrettable that those sermons have not been published. If they exist in written form, it would be well if they were given to the world. They were full of spiritual power and value; they were dignified in style; beautiful and poetic in their phraseology; replete with helpful thought; they were indeed models of what lay-sermons should be.

And we have heard tonight how many-sided his activities had been, and it is remarkable that in every direction that he turned, he brought light and love; he brought strength, he

brought energy; he brought true activity. I shall never forget one occasion in the post-graduate course when he was engaged in elucidating the Book of Judges. It was most interesting to observe his method. He would take the story; he would relate it with a touch of humor, with pathos, he would illustrate it with reference to the poets; he would have with him apt quotations from the great writers of the world. He was eloquent in his presentation of the narrative, and then he drew the moral lesson with unerring directness, so that it effected lodgement in the mind of the hearer. It is now more than 20 years since I attended one of those lessons. It created a profound impression on my mind, one that has never been eradicated. He was discussing "Shamgar," a personage to whom the Bible devotes but four lines. His story is to be found in the 31st verse of the 3rd chapter of Judges. It is so brief that I venture to read it. "And after him was Shamgar, the son of Anath, who smote the Philistines six hundred men with an ox-goad, and he saved Israel." The entire lesson was devoted to that brief passage, and it was elaborated with such a wealth of interesting detail. He brought home to his hearers the thought that the race was not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, that it required not wealth or power or influence or position for a man to accomplish great things in this world. He indicated that with a despicable weapon, an ox-goad, Shamgar was able to defeat the Philistine, to carry out a great victory, and with that weapon he also saved Israel, and I felt then, as I have felt during all these years, that Dr. Leipziger was depicting his own life; his own struggles. Frail in body, one who had twenty years before been practically consigned by his own friends to the grave, one without wealth, without influence, without worldly power, he was able with that weak weapon, to gather victories over the Philistine, and he also saved Israel. He was one who contributed to the Kiddush Hashem, the sanctification of the name of the Jew. That is indeed the true way of saving Israel in these days, and he knew the art.

THE ESSENCE OF JUDAISM

BY PROF. THEODORE REINACH*

I WILL first express my deep gratitude for the cordial greeting which I just received from you, and although your praise has made my modesty suffer very much, I accept it as going beyond and above my head to my own country, for which I know your well deserved feelings, and your sincere sympathy.

When I was first asked a few months ago by your distinguished secretary, Mr. Max Kohler, to deliver a lecture before your society, I declined the offer. The reason was that I am, I will not say a scholar, but a would-be scholar, and therefore, when I give a lecture, I want it to be treated in a scholarly manner and on a subject familiar to my studies. Well, I had not prepared and I had no means to prepare something interesting or original, connected either with the history, archeology or literature of the past of Judaism, and I had too much respect for yourselves and for myself to substitute for a meditated and worked out memoir some hasty and insignificant gossip. Since then, the call having been modified to suit my possibilities, I am very glad to find myself tonight among you, and to be allowed to repay in some measure my debt of gratitude by a very short address, the subject of which, as your chairman has just told you, is simply my personal feeling about the essence of Judaism.

I remember that some twenty or twenty-five years ago, in writing the second edition of a short book on the history of the Jews, which has been perhaps more copied than quoted,—I ventured to express the opinion that Judaism, which in old times had been an Asiatic fact, which in the Middle Ages and modern times had been a European fact, would, perhaps, in the course of time, become chiefly an American fact. What did I mean by this rather adventurous prophecy? I did not mean only that in point of num-

* Address delivered January 30, 1919, at a meeting held in his honor.

ber the Jewish population of America, which was then increasing in a particularly rapid manner, at the beginning of a great stream of immigration from the Eastern countries of Europe,—I did not mean only that in point of numbers, the Jewish population of America would soon be larger than that of perhaps any other country in the World,—I meant also that the legal and social conditions of the Jews in America, that their internal organization, that the forms of their worship, and even the contents or tenets of their faith, would be likely to serve one day or other as pattern for Judaism in the remainder of the Diaspora.

Events have occurred since my writing these lines which by no means oblige me to retract them. It is not that I am prepared to underrate or to ridicule the movement which has arisen under the name of Zionism. The longing of many persecuted and suffering Jews, destitute of any fatherland, to find a home and a shelter in Palestine, is justified, even were it under the protection of one or of several of the civilized nations of Europe. Nor am I blind or unfair to the efforts that have been and are being made by some generous minds in that direction. But it is my intimate and my ripely weighed conviction, that even under the best administration, even under the best economic organization and management, Palestine is hardly able to provide food for the twentieth part of the Jewish population of the world. It is also my intimate conviction that every action tending to retransform Judaism from a religious and spiritual fact to a national and material fact is an endeavor not only to stop, but to reverse, the natural flow and stream of its history, an attempt of reaction doomed to bankruptcy, and the only practical result of which would be to foster, by new arguments and by new weapons, the most dangerous and loathsome form of anti-Semitism,—I mean that anti-Semitism which affects to consider, and represents the Jew as a foreign and unassimilable element, thrust in the core of modern communities, harmful as every strange body of the kind, and which had better be thrown out or destroyed altogether. Therefore, the solution of what is sometimes called the Jewish problem, taking it as a whole, is not, in my opinion, the "return to Jerusalem." We have to accept present conditions, historical facts, stern realities, and do our best

to adjust ourselves to them. Now in no country in the world, as it seems to me, is this process of adjustment more easily to be carried out than in the United States. For you, American Jews, it is a simple question, to know how you can manage, or rather, how you can continue, to be true Americans without denying your Judaism, or, if you prefer to put it in other words, how to remain true and good Jews without betraying in any way your duties, your feelings, your interests, as true Americans.

If, instead of America, I had to speak of the Russia of yesterday, or perhaps of the Turkey of today, I might perhaps use other language, but I am speaking to Americans and of America. Now I know not whether there have been, at any time in this country people of high or low standing inclined to deny or to conceal their quality of Jews, in order to better their social position; in other words, people ashamed of confessing their origin and their faith. I hope not, but if ever this has been the case, I strongly feel that in the present time, such an attitude, independently of its baseness, would carry in itself the stamp of absurdity. For at no epoch in the history of America has the natural bent of civilization, and I may say the program of the best part of mankind, agreed more closely than nowadays with the permanent aims and principles of Judaism, and with those moral discoveries of Jewish thought in which reside its originality and its titles of nobility. In this present dawn of the twentieth century a Jew by birth, objecting to be known as such and trying to sneak out of Judaism, reminds me of a man who, chancing to be called Fulton or Morse, would try to change his name, for fear of being thought related to those great benefactors of humanity.

This opinion may seem at first view rather a paradox, so I will justify it in a few words. You know that the final result of the critical and painstaking labor bestowed on the Bible by several generations of scholars in the past century has been to demonstrate beyond any contest the overwhelming importance of prophetic thought in the making of Judaism, and consequently in the genesis of all those religions which have sprung from Judaism as from a common source. In the words of my great and lamented friend, James Darmsteter, the prophets who, according to the old

traditional conception, appeared as men, who, in times of defection, came to recall to Israel forgotten truths, were in reality the creators, or, if you prefer, the discoverers of these truths; and prophecy, instead of being the flower of Judaism, was in reality its root.

Now, which are the leading ethical principles of prophetism as they have been handed down to us in hundreds of striking passages, in lines of burning passion, of wrath, of sorrow, of joy, of scorn, as well as of high and profound wisdom, which make up the books of the prophets? The teachings may differ somewhat in expression, according as you look for them in the earlier works of an Amos or Hosea, or in the glowing oratory of Isaiah and Jeremiah, or in the lofty poetry of the great Anonymous of the Exile. But the nucleus, the spirit, is always the same; always and everywhere you hear the prophets proclaim, cry out, shriek out, I may say, to the world, two sublime truths. First, that inside of a nation, justice must reign among men, not only justice in the vulgar sense that judges have to decide honestly and candidly accordingly to the law, but in that higher sense, that the law itself has to be shaped so as to protect the weaker, the poorer from oppression, from over-toil, from iniquity and from cruelty, so as to put also a restraint to the excessive accumulation of power and wealth in the hands of a few monopolists. This is the first principle. The second is that among nations themselves the barbarous process of war, of conquest, of pillage and destruction, as it has gone on for centuries after centuries, must come at last to an end; that nations have to learn to adjust their differences without bloodshed; that they have to establish a common rule and an everlasting peace; that they have to gather together in a holy brotherhood under the auspices, under the hand, of their acknowledged Father, the God of Israel, become, by a wonderful process of widening and purifying, the only God of mankind. Social justice on the one hand, organized peace on the other,—such are the prevailing principles, I may say, the sole articles of the moral faith of our prophets, and I may add of Israel itself, for the “essence of Judaism” which I am trying to define, it is precisely in the speeches of the prophets, and only

there, that we have to seek it. Even the Torah,—I mean the chief and finest code of the Torah, the so-called Deuteronomy, is, as you well know, nothing else than a systematic co-ordination of the principles of prophetism by one of the prophets. Everything else, in Judaism is, to use the words of Shakespeare, “Nothing but the trappings and outward show,” things historically and sometimes emotionally very interesting to us, but of no deeper, no wider signification for the salvation of Israel and for the happiness of the whole world.

That such is really the moral import of prophetism, I ought to be dispensed with proving, after the evidence accumulated in the past century by such scholars as Reuss, Wellhausen, Renan and many more. Besides, anyone of you has only to turn over the pages of the Bible to find there the passages alluded to, and which are among the greatest words which have ever been uttered before mankind. So, you will hear Amos proclaim that Israel must expiate her sins because she sold justice for silver and the poor for a pair of shoes. You will hear Hosea putting in the mouth of the Almighty the words, “I desire mercy and not sacrifice.” You will hear Isaiah uttering: “Woe to those that join houses to houses, field to field, till there is no place left and they may be there alone,” and gasping for the stream of righteousness and the flow of justice. You will hear Jeremiah summing up in these words the commands of God: “Fulfill justice and charity; deliver the despoiled from the hand of the oppressor; do not ill-treat the stranger; nor shed innocent blood.” You will hear Habakkuk asking how long we will see them, that is the kings, the emperors, and other conquerors—always emptying their nets to begin again to slay the nations without pity. You will hear the great Anonymous, the so called Deutero-Isaiah, announcing in that wonderful vision, “You believe Israel stricken of God, whereas it is to reclaim them from their sins that she was afflicted. It was for their salvation that she was chastised, and she neither grows weary nor discouraged that justice may be established upon the earth, for the far-off islands, (including, I suppose, America) await her instructions, for the house of Israel shall be called the house of prayer for all people.”

And last, but not least, the prophet Micah will unfold to you the features of regenerated humanity: "God shall be judge between the nations and shall decide for many peoples, and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Such was the hope of the Prophets; such was their teaching, and a great novelty it was in the history of human thought, for you must go down several centuries before hearing similar ideas, much more timidly expressed, under the pens of the Greek and Roman philosophers.

And now let us revert to the actual needs, cares and aspirations of modern humanity, and chiefly of those who have the best right to speak in its name. What has been for a century, the great subject of inquiry, the great care of modern economists and moralists, the great effort of modern internal legislation? It has been to protect the poor and the weak against overwork and against insufficient wages; to insure them against illness and old age; to raise their standard of life by better housing, better clothing, better food and better education; to put some limitation to the possibility of monopolizing public wealth and necessary commodities in the hands of a few powerful tyrants; in other words, an endeavor to effect *social justice*. Even now, in the conference of Paris, or of Versailles, a special committee has been appointed to establish certain rules of social justice applicable to all civilized nations. So here you have one of the two ideals of the prophets that the world is trying to carry out, and Isaiah would be quite in his place if he had a seat in that committee of the Quai-d'Orsay.

And what is the other object on which since about forty years so much ink has been spent in time of peace and, alas, during these last four years of war, so much blood spilt? It is to try to put an end to that intolerable state of so-called "armed peace" which fatally always leads to "armed war," which has strewn the world with hatred, with havoc, with misery, with millions of widows and of orphans, with cities reduced to ashes, fields turned to stony deserts, whole populations dragged from their homes

into exile, and forced labor, as in the times of Tiglath Pileser, Sennacherib and Nebuchadnessar? It is also to organize somehow and somewhere a tribunal of nations, a league or society of peoples, a lasting and real, not a sham and precarious peace, enforced by some supreme council and some effective police force, so as to enable the poor remainder of mankind to breathe, to readjust, to rebuild their shattered homes, to mend their scathed garments, to live, to work, to thrive and to love. That is the aim for which twenty civilized nations are at present uniting their efforts; that is the great message that the President of the United States proclaimed to the world, and that is also the second article of faith, the second moral principle of the old prophets of Israel, and here again the Prophets Micah and Deutero-Isaiah would be entitled to have a seat of honor at the table of the Paris Conference.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have said enough to prove that not only can there be no contradiction whatever between the ideals of civilization and the moral principles as they are accepted by modern Europe and by modern America, and the essence of Judaism, but that, on the contrary, those very principles which today guide humanity, those principles which dominate and inspire the thought and action of the loftiest minds in mankind, are precisely those which were proclaimed more than two thousand five hundred years ago by your spiritual and bodily ancestors, by the founders of the religion which you have preserved in its integrity since those days. Not that I deny that a great part of the teaching of the prophets has been incorporated in other creeds, especially in those that have originated in our own; but without entering into any detail nor into any controversy, I should like to point out that the Gospel, for instance having developed in a period of general despondency, of infinite woe and almost of despair, has, since that time, kept up, consciously or not, throughout the centuries, an undeniable spirit of resignation, a spirit of renunciation concerning this lower world, a spirit of exclusive interest for the undiscovered country beyond the grave, and of exclusive hope in the sanctions of another life. This tendency is very far from what I would call (allow me to coin

the term) the *realistic idealism* of our prophets, it is also very far from the actual tendencies of civilized humanity. Our old prophets, as well as the leading minds, the leading thinkers of modern Europe since the time of the French Revolution, have not been content with picturing a realm of God in after-life; their firm hope, their earnest will is to realize that realm of God in this life; to establish not only mercy, but justice, as far as men can realize justice among men, and also peace, peace material and moral among the nations in this world.

A witty critic some years ago wrote a book about the romanticism of the "Classics," in order to make them thus more actual, to enliven the interest of the public for these old writers. Well, in some sense, we may confidently speak today of the actuality of prophetism. We may speak of Judaism, notwithstanding its venerable age, as of the most up-to-date of all religions, as of the most modern, because it is the most closely in touch and harmony by its ethical tendencies, with the beliefs, the aspirations and the wants of the present age.

To realize those ideals of which I have given so short an outline, can certainly not be the work of a few years. Generations will have to strive, to struggle, to suffer, in order to work out and to carry out entirely those principles. That is not an easy task, but it is a great task, a noble task, and I may say almost a holy task, well worthy of our efforts and of our pains, and to which the best among us, and especially the youngest, will have to devote their brains, their hearts, and maybe their lives.

American Jews have, I am convinced, a great part to play in that new crusade for justice and peace, and you have the satisfaction to be able to play it in full community of thought and of feeling with the great nation to which you now belong. In undertaking the task I have defined you will remain faithful to yourselves and faithful to your past. It is your rare privilege to be able to be proud, alike of being the grandsons of those who first of all in the world have spoken those great words and sowed those glorious seeds, and of being the countrymen of those who have just given to the world the noble example of rushing into war for the sake of those principles of justice, peace and humanity.

MEETING IN HONOR OF THE EARL OF READING

*Lord Chief Justice of England, and British Ambassador to the United
States, April 22, 1919**

ADDRESS BY HON. SAMSON LACHMAN, *Chairman*

WE are proud tonight to welcome the greatest Jew in the world. It delights us that, with all his multifarious duties, he has been able to give us time, and that he is pleased to be with us and to commune with us. The Jews of the world felt a thrill of joy when they learned that Sir Rufus Isaacs had been elevated to the exalted position of Lord Chief Justice of England, a demonstration of the inherent democracy of that great nation, where the actual sovereign power has resided with the people for so many years, and our profoundest congratulations and our wealth of affection went out to that great nation, to the noble representative of our sister nation. For it was then our sister nation, even before the wonderful ties of the past few years, and is now our sister nation. We know that the antagonisms which were engendered by, and which followed our Civil War, and which aggravated previous misunderstandings, were eliminated by the good sense of the people of both countries; by the sterling character and genial disposition of their diplomatic agents; by England's sympathy with all our recent history; by fundamental feelings of kinship and of identity of purpose and of method. Slight murmurings in the present are only like the teasings which are indulged in by those who love each other. The Earl of Reading has discovered the underlying respect and admiration which the people of America as a whole have for his people and for himself. In mediaeval times, the Jew was not allowed to bear

* Addresses at this meeting are printed from stenographic reports, not revised by the speakers.

arms. He was not, therefore, entitled to feudal rights, and he was not permitted to participate in such government as there was. Since then he has borne arms and he has borne them up to the ultimate sacrifice, swayed by his passion for his country. And now we are knocking timidly at the door of the Peace Conference, pleading for the right to live.

The equality of civil and political and religious rights will emerge as a matter of course, and as potent an argument as any is the life history of our distinguished guest, whose services to the entire world in the cause of liberty must convince every people, however hard-hearted and however hard-headed, of the justice and righteousness of our demand and of the degradation of the persecution of the past. Great Britain and America, whether in simple alliance or as parts of a society of nations, can and will see to it that we do not revert to the barbarism of the dark ages. I am sure that our emissaries to the other side, Marshall, Mack, Straus and Morgenthau, would give a great deal to be with us tonight, but we shall soon hear from them, and perhaps they will open for us the closed book of their experiences.

We may not request the Earl of Reading to open his diplomatic portfolio, but we shall be thankful for any definite information which he will feel at liberty to give us.

We cannot sufficiently express the esteem and affection in which we hold his Lordship, and our hopes for a long and distinguished career, replete with happiness and contentment and service to his fellow men.

Mr. Julius J. Frank, the chairman of the Committee of Arrangements for this reception, has the privilege of long personal acquaintance with our honored guest. It has been largely through this acquaintance that we have been able to secure Lord Reading's presence this evening, and no one could more fittingly join in our welcome to him.

ADDRESS BY JULIUS J. FRANK

MY LORD: You have perhaps noticed that the purpose of this society is "the furthering and promoting of the spiritual and intellectual interests of Jews;" that is, if you have been interested in the copy of the constitution which I took the liberty of sending you. But your Lordship cannot know, although I rather sometimes feared that you may have suspected the fact, that from the time that you first came to this country in 1915, by an unwritten law, the Constitution of the Judaeans was amended so as to add this paragraph, in substance: and as among the best possible means for the furtherance of this object, to secure the attendance of Lord Chief Justice Reading at one of the meetings of the society.

We have succeeded—we have been fortunate enough to succeed, in having you here with us this evening, and although the Chairman has said that he was charged with the duty of welcoming you, which is a way he has of cutting the ground from underneath the feet of succeeding speakers, that high privilege is the only thing which I reserved to myself as Chairman of the Committee of Arrangements, and I propose, your Lordship, to say a few words to you by way of welcome.

You have been welcomed so much, so often, and in so many ways in this country that by this time I rather fancy that the mere word "welcome" is dreadful to your Lordship's ears. But elsewhere your Lordship has been welcomed by justices of the highest courts in the land, as one of their number of another country; by members of the Bar as the particularly bright light of their profession; by civic bodies, by reason of your many-sided activities in administrative, executive and diplomatic capacities. We, however, this evening, are welcoming your Lordship in quite a unique fashion. We realize all the great things which are meant by the enumeration of the various activities which I have just mentioned, but we welcome your Lordship this evening, as has been fittingly said by the Chairman, as the greatest Jew of the day in the world.

There may be Jews, fellow Judæans, whom it might be hazardous to approach with an invitation of this kind, but your Committee had no hesitation whatever in approaching Lord Reading, distinctly with the idea of honoring him, as far as a gathering of this kind could honor him, as a Jew.

My Lord, we have not forgotten your participation in your own country in Jewish affairs. We think of the Stepney Free School for Jews, of the Free Schools, of Hampstead Synagogue classes, of the Jews' Hospital and Orphan Asylum, of your interest in the Jewish Boys Brigade, of your connection with the prototype of our society, the Maccabeans. We recall your exhortation to some of these school children, many years ago, that they should feel proud to consider themselves as belonging to one of the most honorable and ancient of races. We remember your Lordship's appeal to the constituencies of England for a larger representation of Jews, as Jews, by Jews, in Parliament. Nor can we forget that since you have attained your present high office, on an occasion when you were entertained by the Corporation of the City of London, you stressed the significance of the appointment of a Jew to that high and exalted position; and that since then you have acted as chairman of a meeting of the Jewish Historical Society of England. Therefore, with no hesitation, we have taken upon ourselves to ask your Lordship to be with us this evening.

We recall these things and your utterances. But there has been one utterance of your Lordship's to which I desire to refer this evening with particular pleasure. At a meeting of the Maccabeans in 1900, your Lordship used these words: "The day will come, we believe, when Jews will play a prominent, valuable and honorable part in the greatest of all professions, whose purpose is the even distribution of justice." That language was appropriate, not only to the occasion, but, by reason of its inherent substance it was appropriate as coming from a Jew to Jews. From its earliest days, Justice, not merely in the narrow sense of the administering of justice by law between man and man, but in its higher meaning as the battle for the right, has

been the cornerstone of the Jewish religion. Always the judge in Israel has been a sacred person. The word which designates his office shows that he is not only next to God, but very near God,—almost God himself. In fact, almost the very first thing that Moses did in founding his commonwealth in the desert, was to divide the people up into convenient units, and to appoint over them judges, of whom he himself was the supreme, or let us say the chief justice. Therefore, these words had more than the significance which attached to the occasion; they had the significance of truth; and what delights us most this evening is that they had the significance of prophecy, of prophecy fulfilled, my Lord, in your own person, by your occupancy many years thereafter of the seat which was adorned by that great democrat, Sir Edward Coke, by that greatest of all English judges, Lord Mansfield, whom by an inverse comparison, we may call the John Marshall of England, and fulfilled by reason of the fact that you are impersonating consciously, publicly and in the sight of all men, the facts of your Jewish as well as your English extraction and make-up.

We therefore hail and welcome you, as all others have welcomed you, but we have in addition to that, the privilege of welcoming you as no others have had the privilege, and we are exercising that privilege tonight.

May I, my Lord, add, just for a moment, a personal touch to this welcome. Ever since we have known the name of Rufus Daniel Isaacs, there has been associated with it the reputation, not only of pre-eminent ability, but of the personal charm and attractiveness which captivated your brethren of the bar in England, its judges, its officials, from King Edward the Seventh down, and which made you, long before we saw, or thought that we might see you among us, an object of our affection. May I add to the welcome which has been extended to you also our welcome as an individual. From any point of view; from every point of view; from every angle, in any capacity in which your many-sided abilities, achievements and genius may present your Lordship, we bid you welcome and thrice welcome.

ADDRESS BY JACOB H. SCHIFF

You have done me a great honor by asking me—although I am rather an inactive member of your Society—to speak on your behalf on this great occasion, when we enjoy the privilege to greet as the guest of the Judæans, Great Britain's distinguished Ambassador, and High Commissioner to our country, Earl Reading, perhaps the most eminent jurist-statesman of modern times. If, as others are, we were judged by our best, instead of the reverse, as is unfortunately so frequently the case, what prestige would Jewry not acquire, because from its very midst has sprung Rufus Isaacs, Barrister, who through his own great qualities and capacities has successively risen, as Sir Rufus Isaacs, to the Attorney-Generalship of Great Britain—as Lord Reading, to the Lord Chief Justiceship of England—and as the Earl of Reading, to be Ambassador and High Commissioner of his mighty country, to its great sister nation, our own United States. Lord Reading was no doubt chosen because in these most crucial times in the world's history, a diplomatic representative was needed who would be certain to assure the firm standing together of America and Great Britain with its Allies, in order to save civilization from threatened breakdown. That this has been accomplished, it is true, is due to quite a number of great leaders in our own and in Allied countries, among whom, however, Lord Reading will ever stand forth with special distinction.

It is now reported that the Ambassador, having successfully accomplished the weighty mission with which he had been entrusted, is about to return home to resume the Chief Justiceship of his country, from which he had only temporarily retired to assume the grave responsibilities of the Ambassadorship at Washington. No doubt, however, upon his return, Lord Reading will necessarily be called upon by his Government for advice in almost every serious and important question which may present itself. In particular, his counsel is certain to be sought on the momentous problem that has for a considerable time so deeply aroused American Jewry—the terrible conditions under which

our co-religionists in the Near East are compelled to live. The suffering—nay, torture—inflicted upon these unfortunates, even the very large material sacrifices American Jewry has brought—and continues to bring—scarcely suffice to assuage or more than momentarily ameliorate. The situation that actually exists is frightful—the horrors beyond belief. In our youth we shuddered when our parents and teachers recounted to us the tales of suffering of our ancestors in the Middle Ages, and now we see these repeated in our own times. It well nigh appears as if the persecution and suffering of the Jew were never to end,—as if the world had room for all, except for those who first found Him who has created all mankind.

Efforts are now being made at Paris by our own representatives, upon whose earnestness we know we can rely, in conjunction with worthy representatives of England's and France's Jewry, to have included in the treaties now being formulated by the Peace Conference, covenants securing for the Jewish inhabitants of all lands equal rights with the rest of the population. In addition, however, protection by the League of Nations will be needed, in order that these rights shall be maintained, and not again made "a scrap of paper," or a dead letter, as has been permitted for the past four decades to be done, in so shameful a manner, by Roumania, notwithstanding the solemn obligations assumed by the signatories to the Treaty of Berlin.

Notwithstanding the disquieting reports which have been cabled here during the past week, we have every hope and expectation that our representatives will succeed in Paris—in fact, it cannot be otherwise,—for no people are entitled to the privilege of self-determination of self-government, who are unwilling or unable to extend equal rights and give full protection to all within their dominion, and who permit conditions to exist in their midst, which are a blot upon the civilization of the twentieth century.

We know, however, that whatever may be attained, in this respect, to Great Britain and America, in the first instance, humanity and world Jewry must and will look, to make felt promptly and effectually their great influence and power, in order

that such conditions as now exist in the Near East shall be ended once and forever.

I have perhaps spoken somewhat at length upon this harrowing situation, but I feel justified in profiting by so exceptional and unique an opportunity, to bring before our honored guest that which agitates all Jewry—and in particular American Jewry—so very deeply, in the hope and confident expectation that he will deem it proper to bring this in turn upon his return, before his great and worthy associates in Britain's government.

May I be permitted to end in the words of Mordecai of old, addressed to Queen Esther: "Perhaps you have risen to this elevated state to enable you to assist in saving your people." For these hard-pressed men and women and children, are of your people, to whom we know you are greatly attached, as they are of my people, for whom I have the deepest compassion, in their extreme misery, and who are going to perish, I fear, unless Great Britain and America, with their great power, interpose to prevent it.

And now, my Lord, not only for myself, but alike for this great assemblage, which represents the best in New York Jewry, its intelligentsia, always active in the uplift of our people, let me wish you Godspeed and every further success upon your way!

ADDRESS BY HON. ABRAM I. ELKUS

I AM willing to concede what the Chairman of the Arrangement Committee for this meeting, Mr. Frank, stated, that the Chairman had monopolized all the words of welcome to our distinguished guest and that none were left for those who were to follow, but I am somewhat in a dilemma, and I am in that dilemma after hearing the speakers who preceded me, as to whether I am to speak words of welcome or words of farewell. Perhaps I may say we welcome our guest of this evening in no uncertain terms, and we express our regret, if the news that we hear be true, that when we but welcome him, it means that we also say farewell.

It is to be counted indeed a high privilege to be one of those to speak tonight words of either welcome or farewell to one who comes to us not only as one of the foremost citizens of that great land, that wonderful country of advancement which he so ably represents, but who comes in the far, far higher position than that, because of his achievements, because of his great position, because of himself, not only as a citizen of that land and its spokesman, but more than that, as a citizen of the world, and as the foremost representative of that great faith of ours, to which we all belong, and proud, proud we are that we belong to it.

True it is, that there is written in the constitution of this body that it is for the advancement of Jewish principles, but I take it that we are a body of idealists, and that we welcome our guest of tonight because he too is an idealist. We are all seekers after ideals,—those of our faith—and we who have been for five thousand years the seekers, the pursuers of an ideal, and have suffered as no other people under the sun during those five thousand years, and suffer today, because we loved, and we sought, an ideal that was justice. And we and the whole world, the whole world of idealists, will look with straining eyes, with beating hearts, and hope, that there may come out of those deliberations in that far-off land, that there may come, come soon, not only the formal ending of war, not only the seal that may be placed upon the ending of war, but there may come that covenant, that expression of the will which may mark the ending of all wars,—that dream of the idealist—he was said to be a dreamer when he dreamed that ideal, he whom all the world, honors today, all the world looks up to, because he points the path—that great leader of ours—the path to perpetual peace. And we of this ancient faith of ours, we look with eyes strained, too, but with eyes blinded many times by tears, because we know of the miseries that have been but outlined—to those unfortunates of ours,—we look to that body to declare for us and for ours, not privilege, not favor, but a simple declaration, enforced as it must be by the great nations that stand behind it, that, throughout the world where there be men and women and

children of our faith they may not have privilege, but that one great thing, that one great principle for which America, with all the great nations of the earth, fought and shed its blood, that one thing that stands above all others in this world—Justice.

It is indeed a high privilege, your Excellency, that we who are gathered here tonight, join in not only welcoming you to this land of ours, but welcoming you as one of our brethren, because all the world over, of whatever nation they may be citizens, of whatever people they may be a part, in faith, all Israel are brothers. We welcome you as a brother in faith, as a brother in spirit and as a brother in ideals. We turn tonight a page in the history of the world. We turn from a page on which has been written, written too in wonderful characters, the triumphs of war, those things that force has gained and achieved, and the triumphs of might,—we turn from that page to a far brighter and a more glorious one, on which is written not what force has won, but what peace is going to bring with her, what justice is going to bring—great immutable justice, which you, Sir, typify in your person,—what justice is going to bring to all the peoples of the earth, the small and the great, the powerful, and those that are weak. We turn, and write upon that glorious page the triumph of the right, the right that stands above and supersedes—all the right that comes with justice and which you, Sir, are privileged to write upon that page in letters that may never die—what justice can do—so that as a part at least, those peoples suffering and down-trodden and persecuted almost beyond belief may have their place in the sun, in which to live, as all men and women under God have a right to enjoy.

Your Excellency, we can only say to you that from our hearts we welcome you as one of us, and when you go, go to newer glories and to greater calls, you go carrying with you the esteem and affection of your brethren in Israel in America!

ADDRESS BY REV. DR. STEPHEN S. WISE

I TRUST his Lordship is not unduly overborne by the character of the gentlemen who are members of the Judæans. Ac-

according to the chairman the Judaeans are the elect of the elect of the elect.

I know why I have been asked to come here tonight, because I saw Lord Reading with the President of the United States in London. I remember the procession,—Lord Reading did not see the procession. I was more favored than he because he was of the procession. I saw the King and Queen, and other personages go by in their wonderful royal coaches, one of which was amply and quite wonderfully occupied by the guest of the evening.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I paid no attention either to his Lordship or the President of the United States. You must not think I am a Republican, because I say that—I was interested, standing as I was at a window of the Hotel Carlton, which is only about three minutes as the motor flies from Charing Cross Station where his Lordship awaited our President,—I was interested in watching an equestrian statue, as the President hastened by. That statue was made of bronze, as they have a habit of being made, and I noticed that the rider of the horse was not at all comfortable. He was enswathed in a huge American Flag, and his left hand bore another American flag. Now, you know, bronze isn't a particularly mobile or expressive medium, and still I felt the rider of that horse wasn't a bit happy. Why should he be? After Lord Reading and the President had passed by, I went down to that statue, which I am sure his Excellency will recall. It was a statue of George the Third. Fancy George the Third, the dear, fat old George, resurrected from the dead long enough to wave an American flag for an American President!

It has seemed to me, unsophisticated as I am, and unacquainted with the devious ways of statesmen and lawyers, it has seemed to me that his Lordship was peculiarly advantaged when he came to America. In the first place, he entered into a noble succession, punctuated by great names,—the name of Pauncefote, the friend of America in time of need; the name of Herbert; the name of Bryce; the name of that perfect English gentleman, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice. For one thing he entered upon that succession, and though it might have seemed that his post would be extraordinarily difficult, remember that he and his predecessor

alike were again advantaged by the circumstance that Bernstorff had been in Washington—Bernstorff, the super active, never-to-be-forgotten by reason of the activities of his supers. Neither Spring-Rice, nor the Earl of Reading, set out to coerce and to command the good will of America, for the good reason that it was not necessary, because, to paraphrase a word spoken by Mark Twain in your own City, for the reason, that an Englishman under the American flag is not an alien, nor a stranger, but always at home.

Again, I would call your attention to the circumstance that his Lordship was advantaged in yet another way. May we not believe that in devoting himself to the difficult and delicate task of serving as ambassador and mediator between the two great English speaking peoples, as John Bright once said, two nations but one people, Lord Reading was helped by reason of the circumstance that he comes of a mediatorial people? I mean just that, a people always firmly, finely self-reverent and self-reliant, withal, not without the capacity to reverence the life of any and every other people. I count it not chance at all that, excluding from consideration all the members of the Judæans, the most distinguished of living Jews, the Earl of Reading and Justice Louis D. Brandeis, the two most eminent of Jews, are alike serving their countries, or have, in what I venture to call a mediatorial capacity as jurists, as justice-bringers, of course, as great servants of their country.

The distinction of the Earl of Reading would mean little to us as fellow Jews, if our guest as an Englishman stood alone, or if as a Jew he stood apart from his people. For us the honor lies in the circumstance that the Earl of Reading is one of that goodly company of Jews who are finely devoted to Great Britain, and that he does not stand apart or remote from Jewish life and Jewish interests, but that, as is true of every Jew worthy of the name, the Earl of Reading could not think of himself as related to his people by the accident of birth, but as of them, rather than for them, by his own will of election. The finest of all, in truth, is not the position that one great Jew has come to hold in Great Britain, but the position of Great Britain touching all Jews.

Great Britain does not treat one Jew as a great man ; Great Britain treats all Jews as if they were a great people. Even as the important thing for the Jew in all lands is not that one Jew should come to achieve eminence, but that all Jews shall be outstanding and even eminent as citizens of their respective commonwealths. The Balfour Declaration of November, 1917, momentous to the Jewish people for all times, the Balfour Declaration is nothing more than the final ratification and illustration of Great Britain's position to the Jews in 1655. The Balfour Declaration is not a matter of personal sympathy with Jews on the part of Mr. Lloyd George, on the part of Mr. Balfour, on the part of their associates of the then-War Cabinet.

Mr. Elkus and Mr. Schiff, and others, have spoken of our knocking at the door of the Conference at Paris. We did not knock at the doors. No self-respecting Jew knocks at doors as a beggar. Being so proud, we have no need to beg. We stood before the Princes of Earth,—those of us in any wise elected by the mandate of a people,—and we were not afraid. If the day come, as come it will, I believe, when justice, the justice of equal status and the realization of the Balfour Declaration come to pass, it will be due in largest part to the moral and spiritual leadership of President Wilson on behalf of America, and Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Balfour on behalf of the British commonwealth, it will be their work and their achievement.

Your Lordship, I take it that I have been asked to say the last word before we hear you, because we knew that you would not be happy tonight, if I did not invoke a benediction in Hebrew. And I dare say that his Lordship is likely to understand my Hebrew better than my English, because it must be a very great strain for a man who speaks English to listen to Americans. So I must speak the word of parting to the Earl of Reading in the old terms of our Fathers. (Hebrew) "Blessed art thou in thy coming, Blessed be thou in thy going."

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, THE EARL OF READING

I NEED not tell you that I have been suffering for some little time. But I forgot it in the eloquent speeches to which I have listened. It was only when the personal references came to myself that I recalled again that I was, for a moment, and must be, a martyr. To hear the observations which were made of me by successive speakers was really, I almost believe, intended as a test of my capacity for self-control. Was it possible that I should listen all through without blushing? Whether I did or not, I am unable to say, but I will tell you in all earnestness and sincerity that I am glad that you think so well of me. I am just enough to say that I don't deserve much of what was said. I am also just enough to say that, if intention and purpose count as to value of action, then I claim the full credit.

I wish I had the privilege of a minister. I will not say that I wish I had his eloquence, because to that I do not aspire to attain, but the privilege that he had of reflecting upon the members of the society, and the obvious pleasure that he took in doing it, made me wish that I could add to the various positions that I occupy that of a spiritual minister.

But I am tonight your guest, as a member with you of our community. I rejoice that I have had the opportunity of meeting the members of this society. I take leave, in the pride of a free Englishman, to differ from some of those pleasant but, nevertheless, rather badinage observations of the minister, to say that I am convinced from what I know, from what I have seen and from what I have heard, that if I am not addressing all the culture and intellect of Judaism in New York, I am at least addressing many of its chief representatives.

But I am addressing you also in the capacity of British Ambassador, and nothing that I can say can disassociate me from that position. If I were minded to speak to you, simply giving utterance to my own personal sentiments, I should be doing wrong. I cannot sever myself from the position of the accredited representative of my country in the United States. That it

should so happen that I am also a member of your community gives an added zest to the pleasure of my being with you this evening, and I trust the pleasure which you are enjoying is to some extent equal to that that I have experienced and am now experiencing. But I must remember, and I beg you to remember, that I cannot speak outside of my representative capacity. Fortunately, we have one ambassador present besides myself, and somewhere out of that eye in the back of my head, which everybody ought to have, I have discovered that Mr. Elkus is feeling for me and with me. I don't know how many ex-ambassadors there may be amongst you, but those that are there will also share my feelings. A diplomat is always in a difficult position when he makes a speech. It is not the habit of governments to entrust their definite statements to the diplomats in other countries, because governments like to make these utterances themselves, and if I spoke to you, it might be thought that I am announcing some conclusion which has not yet been definitely arrived at. It might be thought, again, that I am concealing something which I know, and that I am speaking with the determination not to communicate anything. There is some truth in both of those statements. There is the whole truth in neither. And the delicate position of an ambassador is not diminished by the recollection that there is an assemblage of the most distinguished men in the world sitting at present in Paris, who are engaged both in making and unmaking states, and therefore I will ask you to bear in mind when I am addressing you, during the short time that I shall occupy your attention, that I am, besides being your guest, and sharing with you in all the pleasures, which I have been told and verily believe it has given to you as also has been given to me,—let me remind you that I must speak with much caution, and let me also tell you, in case you may not know it, that there are many things which you may think are perfectly well known to me which I can assure you have not yet reached me.

But it is indeed fitting, if I may be permitted to say it, that you should have invited me as the representative of Great Britain to meet you this evening, because, as Dr. Wise reminded you

so well—it is from Great Britain that came that great, historic declaration of Mr. Balfour, in the name of the British Government, which received so much support from allied nations, and which has indeed been as the kindling of a great light in Israel.

I know that there has been some controversy as to the exact significance to be given to the words which Mr. Balfour used. It is quite possible that all the interpretations are not correct. It reminds me rather of a distinguished poet of ours who was asked to explain the meaning of the language that he had used in a verse. There were so many interpretations arrived at by cultured and learned societies that he was puzzled at the end himself, and only hoped that he had had them all in mind when he wrote those words. But I may say to you as an individual, that it is not surprising that, throughout the world of Judaism, there was great and enthusiastic acclamation of that celebrated statement of Mr. Balfour's. Whatever the view may be that you take of it, and Heaven forbid that I should ever step into that controversial domain, this at least must stand firm in every community, in every assembly where Jews are gathered,—it stands as a recognition for all time of the right, civil, religious right, and the full liberty of the Jews throughout the world. Whether a man be a Zionist, or whether not, all will rejoice that the opportunity is given, that the declaration of policy at least is made by the British Government, that those Jews whose racial, religious, national or other aspirations may prompt them to go to Palestine, their homeland, will have the opportunity of settling there. I avoid so far as I can, and I am never quite sure that I am doing it, the language which might lead some one society or another to claim me as its adherent. I am trying in the best way I can, to give expression to those innermost thoughts which must actuate us all, without at the same time espousing the cause of either one or the other of the controversialists. But I do know that this statement has meant much, because, after all, although no one would expect either that all Jews would wish to go to Palestine or that Palestine could receive all Jews, nevertheless, we do know that in that country, with the policy to be pursued which has been declared, and that when

effect is given to it, that there at least will be a land to which those who are unhappy under persecution, religious or otherwise, those who have suffered martyrdom for the simple reason that they happen to have been born Jews, will be able to go, and if not able, will be assisted by their more prosperous brethren, to hie them to the land where at least they can say they are at home. After all, it is not unnatural that you here in America, and we in Britain, should be of the same opinion. I recall not only the history of Great Britain and its treatment of the Jews, to which Dr. Wise and others have already given utterance, but the action of America and Americans in past time. Why, sir, (addressing Mr. Schiff) I remember your own action,—you yourself raised your voice with others at a time when persecution, unfortunately, was dogging the very footsteps of Jews in certain countries. What the result may be of the labors of America and Great Britain it may be rash to prophesy, save that I think we are entitled to say, and to assume, that liberty, civil liberty, religious liberty must prevail wherever these countries have an influence, wherever they can bring their authority to bear.

I will not hazard a conjecture as to what is happening at Paris at this moment, save that again I shall not hesitate to affirm that the decisions arrived at are conceived in justice, and are based on liberty. The men who are there, particularly those who are best known to you, and those best known to me, can only work for justice and for liberty, because it is the very breath, the very spirit, of the men. For sir, this war can come to an end, we verily believe. It was waged for civilization, for great and immutable principles. It has effected at least much of its purpose. It has conquered military despotism. It is, I verily believe, vindicating at this moment international law, and it will be true to itself only if also it stands for that justice and liberty which was proclaimed throughout the war, not only in our country, but almost I had said in louder tones, and with greater vibration, throughout this country by you here, who were not so close to the battle, and you were stirred to the depths by the ideal, possibly the only ideal, which would have driven you to take the steps that you did, and to cast everything

that you had into the balance, the ideal that you were striving to secure, this justice, this liberty, which you had, throughout the world, to make it a better and a happier place to live in.

In my country we began the war by calling upon our citizens to enlist voluntarily. We were not prepared with a great army. We thought that our part was to provide a great navy and to that, to the best of our ability, we devoted ourselves—to provide supplies, to assist with finances, but we did not think that millions of men would be required of us. I pause not to consider the question,—I only refer to it in order to explain how it was, that suddenly we found ourselves calling upon our young men to enlist. And I refer to that only for one reason—just to tell you that if you had been there with us, you would have felt, as I did, the thrill of satisfaction that in a country which had behaved to Jews as England had, the young generation of Jews responded with alacrity, with enthusiasm, indeed, racing to see who could be first to serve under the Union Jack. I speak of men I know, and of things that I have seen. And I only say this to you, not through a desire to claim any special credit for it—we do not wish special credit; we did what was the bounden duty of every citizen of his country. Be it remembered, and all history will show it, that in those lands in which the Jews are treated with justice and equality, there is a fervid patriotism and a faith of citizenship that will bear comparison with any class in any community and in any country. It is only what should be expected from those who, after all, have been known throughout the generations as men who have done their duty, who have sought justice and who have tried to do justice. For this war, after all, appealed to us as perhaps no other war could, because it raised on high for all to see the great standard of justice, fully poised, neither bending to the one side or the other, blind to religion, blind to race, merely standing there embodying impartial justice to all men. And therefore it called forth our best. Here in this country I know what has happened. There was enlistment and there was also conscription. And it is again the greatest satisfaction to you, I know, as it is certainly to us, who are not citizens of your country, to realize how much has

been done in the same way, how excellent was the response, and how well your people have acquitted themselves on the field of battle. I often think, and indeed I never can address an audience of Americans without the thought being with me at all moments, so that I have even the greatest difficulty to restrain myself from giving utterance to it too often—when I think of what American entry into the war meant to us. There were times in the great struggle when the victory, in which we always had confidence, seemed at a very remote distance,—at times even the men with the keenest sight could not reach it. There were clouds, very black clouds, over the vista, and faith alone could carry men along the way. There came the day when America stepped in, and said “We are with you,” and with that saying America meant, as we knew, that when she had said it, she would see it through to the bitter end. Ah, then, I can assure you, the mists cleared. There was a beautiful sun shining over the vista and the distance seemed suddenly to have become comparatively short; how short none of us knew at that time, and indeed I think none of us expected it to be quite as short as it was, but it had a magnificent effect. And let me assure you that it was not only because you were sending the men; it was not only because you were lending all your material support; that you were sending munitions of your own; that you were lending moneys; that you were building ships; that you were sending your navy to help with ours; that you were shipping your soldiers as fast as you could train them; it was not only that. You may perhaps not quite realize all that it meant. It was the moral support that America gave when she elected to come into the struggle with us that encouraged and stimulated all of the Allies, wherever they might be, that brought to them not only the additional evidence of the justice of their cause, but it set the seal upon their judgment, by bringing into it a nation which never had fought except for the purpose of securing justice and liberty.

And now let me say to you that I shall carry away from here this evening the recollection of my meeting with you and of your splendid welcome to me, with the addition of the words

of farewell which were spoken, and strange as it may seem, rightly spoken. I am going back within a short period to my own country, not because I desire it, but because it is my duty to go back there, and do that which pertains to my lot, whatever it may be. I am, as you have been reminded, Lord Chief Justice of England. I am not sure but what you needed reminding of it,—sometimes I have needed reminding myself, and when I think of going home and taking my seat again as Lord Chief Justice and remember that it will be expected of me that, when occupying that seat, I shall know some law, I confess that I am a little appalled at the prospect of what I shall have to read before I can properly discharge the duties which are mine. But I shall go back there with the knowledge that here in America I have made, as I believe, many friends. If I were to take *ad literam* some of the beautiful things that have been said to me tonight and on other nights, I should be in grave danger of thinking more of myself than is my just due. But, nevertheless, I know that these manifestations of friendship, aye, as you said, Sir, (addressing Mr. Frank) of affection, which all love to treasure, are really springing from you Americans to me as the representative of the nation which has sent me here in my present capacity. I love to think that it is that, that you honor. I rejoice to think that you have affection and admiration for the British. It pleases me beyond words to think that our British administration has called forth tributes from you. And above all, I carry with me the profound conviction that however others may strive to embroil, that whatever may be said by those who for one reason or another, have their little fling at the British Lion, sometimes, not nearly so ill-naturedly meant as it appears—however that may be so, I am carrying with me the conviction that you and we, the English speaking peoples of the world, are united together as never before, because we have fought together; we have bled together; we have struggled together, to maintain a great ideal, which is that which was originally yours and ours in the common ancestry of Britain, which is your heritage, as it is our heritage, which has been invigorated and refreshed by you in your country, swept as it is from one ocean to

another, which has gained strength in ours from its sea-girt coast and the strong breezes that blow upon it. With the knowledge that we shall work together, that we shall never forget what has happened between us; that we shall struggle always to maintain particularly that civil and religious liberty which we have learned so to prize, we shall hope that this Peace Conference now sitting, which I verily believe will give us a peace that will make an end of wars for a very long time to come, if not forever—for that peace which will mean the triumph of democracy, for that peace which shall be the enthronement of justice on high for all nations to look up to, for that peace which shall make for the happiness and the prosperity of the peoples of the world.

AMERICAN JEWISH WAR RELIEF ABROAD*

BY DAVID M. BRESSLER

I have been asked, what will this Seventeen Million Dollars raised by American Jewry in 1922 do? I have a fairly good idea, especially since I was privileged to be a member of the Commission and have had the opportunity to visit many countries abroad, including Austria, Hungary, Poland, Old and New Roumania and Constantinople. A detailed exposition cannot be given in the time at my disposal. But I can try to give you some kind of picture which in a way will visualize for you the situation there, and what still remains to be done.

Everywhere we went we had access to all possible sources of information. We got the viewpoint of every class, Rabbis, lay-leaders, political groups, and most important of all, of that vast class which had been aided thru the generosity of American Jewry. We got a good insight into the work for, and the needs of, the refugees and repatriates—the last mentioned constituting that vast army of men, women and children, which had been driven from their homes by advance of the enemy hordes or who were carried along by their own retreating armies—They have been returning in the past year or two, mostly from Russia to different parts of Poland, destitute, almost naked, after weeks, and not infrequently, months, of weary walking on the highways, to find their homes wholly or partly destroyed and their city a mass of ruins. Especially was this true of sections in and about Vilna, Brest-Litovsk, Kovno, Lemberg, Brody, and Wisnitz and Sadaqura in the Bukowina, now Roumania. Refugees we met everywhere, and generally they were those who fled from Russia to escape, as they told us, the intolerable conditions existing there.

* Address delivered as Guest of Honor before the Judaeans November 26, 1922.

They have no homes to return to, and since neither Poland nor Roumania permits their permanent settlement in those countries, their future lies largely in the lap of fate. But for the service, advice and aid extended to them by the representatives of the J. D. C. (Joint Distribution Committee), untold numbers of them would perhaps no longer be among the living.

We saw the magnificent service rendered by another branch of our work there—The Medical Sanitary Department—which in a short space of time had repaired or rebuilt ruined hospitals and sanatoria, so that they might function again. We were gratified to see thoroughly sanitary public bath-houses—a Jewish institution in Poland,—repaired or rebuilt, and realized what they meant, not only for the religious life of the community, but for the promotion of hygiene among the population. We were vastly impressed by the campaign waged by these remarkable men against epidemics, such as dysentery and typhus, and in this, remember, they received no state aid. The initiative of these men was unbounded—of their own accord a nurses training school was started, for among other things there is a lamentable lack of trained nurses in Poland, and another school has been started for the training of men and women to operate X-ray machines for the cure of favus, a nasty scalp disease from which thousands of children are suffering.

We visited hundreds of homes and many orphan asylums where war or pogrom orphans were being sheltered and cared for, by the Child-care department of the J. D. C., which at the time of our visit was supporting about 12,000 such orphans, 10,000 in Poland alone, many of whom had been found hiding in fear and trembling in the most out-of-the-way places, after they had witnessed the slaughter of one or both their parents. One can easily imagine what tender care and attention were required to restore them to a semblance of their former selves, to help them forget, if possible, the horrors they had lived through.

Last, but not least, I want to mention the work being done by the Reconstruction Department of the J. D. C., a work of reconstruction in every sense of the term. Many of the places we visited, as I mentioned before, had been almost totally de-

stroyed. In some places only a few ruins were left to mark the spot which at one time had been a city or town. Added to the difficulties of a shattered economic life, the repatriates found themselves without shelter or home, except temporary barracks, and these failing, within the walls of almost barren and damaged synagogues, in which they were crowded to the point of suffocation. You would be gratified and amazed to see how the Reconstruction Department tackled this gigantic problem. Through their efforts, thousands of homes have been repaired and rebuilt (we saw almost 600 such in two places alone), creating hope and renewed ambition in the breasts of these weary wanderers, and fortifying them in their efforts to rehabilitate themselves by the knowledge that the day's work done, they can wend their way to what will eventually become their own fireside. For it should be observed that every effort is being made to safeguard the return of at least part of the cost of these buildings—a wise and highly necessary measure—in view of the large number of homes which must be repaired or rebuilt, and the limited amount of money available for this purpose. Thousands upon thousands of time-loans of moderate size have been given to mechanics and artisans throughout Central and Eastern Europe, with which to purchase tools and other equipment, to enable them to pursue their calling. Trade schools have been aided and encouraged to give boys and girls mechanical or technical training, and so fit them for life's battle.

I think you will agree that the picture I have drawn for you portrays a colossal job conceived in a statesmanlike way, and worthily carried out. We were convinced that America's stepping into the breach had saved the lives of thousands upon thousands of men, women and children, and that through its never-wearying activity had helped a vast number of people back on the road to self-support and self-respect. The fear that had been in our hearts that we would come upon a people pauperized, inert, lacking in initiative, and, repeating a phrase I have heard upon several occasions, "laying down" on their American brethren, happily proved groundless. Poverty we met everywhere, more than you can possibly imagine. Suffering and sick-

ness still stalk among them, but we saw no cringing, no laying down, no lack of ambition, and except for bereaved mothers and wives, very few broken spirits. On the contrary, in these lands where Zadakah had its roots and is a household word, not only preached but practised, the pride, self-initiative and responsibility of the people manifested themselves in a way which brought happiness and joy to our hearts, and made us proud to feel that they were our brothers.

Perhaps I should have mentioned before this, that in its manifold activities, the J. D. C. has invariably had the active and effective cooperation and support of the communities themselves, in which they were operating. It has been a fixed policy of the J. D. C. to organize the resources of each community or district in a way which would not impair their spirit of self-help and initiative. There is therefore hardly a community today where the actual work is not being done, wholly or in part, by their own chosen representatives—under a fair amount of proper supervision. Thus it becomes possible for the J. D. C. to plan for its gradual withdrawal as the directing force in the work, and to turn it over entirely to the communities themselves. But do not think for a minute that this can be accomplished this year or even next. There is still much to be done, even though we shorten our lines everywhere as rapidly as conditions warrant. We must not forget that even though we care at present for only 10,000 orphans in Poland, these will have to have our aid until they are made self-supporting, or until such time as the improved fortunes of Eastern Jewry shall enable them to relieve us of the responsibility. At present they have their hands more than full to provide even in a most meagre way for those war orphans, whom we have not been able to care for—more than 23,000 in number. We must keep in mind that it is an imperative necessity to rebuild many more destroyed homes, hospitals, orphan asylums, sanitarium, to equip them properly, that thousands of refugees and repatriates,—thank God their number is growing less day by day—must be given the opportunity to re-establish their lives, that trade schools must be revived and equipped—to the accomplishing of which the J. D. C. stands

definitely committed. It has its mandate from American Jewry which pledged something like \$17,000,000 in the spring of this year to carry to a successful issue the work begun in 1915. Every dollar has its own errand of mercy and is a debt of honor which every person who pledged will know how to redeem. There can be no thought of repudiation. For the Jews of America do not break faith with the widow and the orphan. This fund of course takes into account the great and dire need of Jewry in famine-stricken Russia.

We in this country who have given no matter how generously of our means and service, have been privileged to participate in a marvelous work of rescue. The undertaking of the stupendous task which your contributions made possible must cause you a thrill of joy, as the results thereof are conveyed to you. And just think, we in America merely gave money. We ran no danger of penetrating into areas infested by vermin, filth and contagious diseases. We did not place our lives in jeopardy in districts over-ridden by robber bands and worse—what then shall be said of our workers who went abroad, who brought relief and succor to starving, suffering and sick and diseased men, women and children—who without a thought of self, cheerfully braved death without a moment's hesitation, in the cause of their brethren? When the history of this life-saving work is recorded, a place of honor, second to none, shall be given these self-sacrificing, self-effacing field-workers, from the first to the last, who left home and security to minister to their suffering brethren. For all this, for their earnestness, for their zeal, for their persistence in the face of every danger to obstacle, this word of heartfelt appreciation is the least we can offer them.

And now for a final word—The last thing we looked for among a people who had suffered so terribly, and who are still suffering, was genuine gratitude. Cynics had sneered and prophesied that we would be met with ill-humored complaints and criticism that the prosperous American brother had been niggardly (many were), and that not enough had been done for them. To you I say that our brethren on the other side choked up and their eyes filled with tears as they spoke of what their

American brethren had done for them. "Tell them," their message is "that we bless them by day and by night, that the reward of the righteous shall be theirs, because but for them we should have perished."

BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND JEWISH SCIENCE*

BY DR. FELIX PERLES

THIS evening, when it is for the first time my privilege to speak to such a large and illustrious Jewish audience in New York, I beg to return my sincere thanks, not only to you for the kind invitation you addressed to my dear colleague Elbogen and to me, but simultaneously for the cordial reception we found in this greatest Jewish town in the world, and if I look for an adequate expression of our feelings in these six weeks since our arrival, I must think of a striking word in the Palestinian Talmud, where Joshua Ben Levi says: "If you are asked 'where is your God?' then answer: In the great town of Rome." The sight of the world's capital reminded him of the greatness of God, whose spirit lived in those that had built it. The same impression we experienced here, where the old Jewish God reveals His power more forcibly than in any other place in the world. In a society like yours, which desires "to promote and further the intellectual and spiritual interests of Jews," I need not explain what I mean by this revelation of God, and you expect rather that I should tell you something of my special field of work. But if I do so, I cannot help showing in what direction such a revelation can and must be intensified. It is the scientific investigation of the Bible that hitherto has been neglected to an unintelligible degree in Jewish circles and even in Jewish colleges. The Bible is not only chronologically the foundation-stone of Judaism, inasmuch as it contains the oldest record of the Jewish religion, but also in its historical importance it has remained the purest and most original source of religious life among us. Since Judaism exists, all spiritual

* Address delivered as a guest of honor at a meeting held November 26, 1922.

movements and revolutions in our community have been connected with the Hebrew text of the Bible. The Hebrew original was the only thing lasting and given from the first, and every new thought, every new institution, was obliged to prove the test of its legitimacy in Judaism by demonstrating its accordance with the words of Scripture. The oldest Halaka and Haggada, in their external form, profess to be no other thing than the right interpretation and application of the Biblical text. A reaction against this free dealing with the Scripture and this reading into it of much that originally was not in it, gave rise to Caraim, clinging to the letter of the Bible, and produced on the other hand within Judaism a rational Bible interpretation pressing into its service for exegesis all the scientific resources of the time. Nor could philosophy gain a place in Judaism but by finding Aristotle in the Bible, and Maimonides' "Guide of the Perplexed," if not by its form, at least by its contents and tendency, wishes only to demonstrate that Aristotle and his pupils indeed say the same thing as Moses and the Prophets, though in slightly different words. The Kabbala too could only become a power by proving in the Zohar its apparent accordance with the Bible. Finally, even Moses Mendelssohn's work of enlightenment would not have had so many adherents, if the Biur, the commentary attached to his German Translation of the Pentateuch, had not seemed to give its sanction to his words.

However, not only within Judaism was the Bible always the heart of religious and spiritual life, but also in the influence exerted outside, the Bible was a very missionary of Judaism to the non-Jewish world. By the Septuagint, Judaism appealed for the first time to the Gentile, and later on the soil prepared by Christianity grew. The Church, though from the outset claiming to supersede Judaism, and therefore cutting all bonds of connection with it, could not do without including the Jewish Bible, now called the Old Testament, among its holy writings, and thus unwillingly witnessed to its priceless value and absolute necessity for the religious education of mankind. Islam too borrowed its best and most effective ideas from the treasury of Biblical Judaism, and though replacing the Bible itself by the Koran,

assimilated a large share of its contents. During the Middle Ages, cross and crescent checked an advance of the genuine Biblical doctrines. But there came a time when Europe longed for a Renaissance and did not find it anywhere but in the Hebrew Bible. All at once the Jews were recognized as guardians of the most precious possession of mankind, and instead of reviling them, learned professors and mighty cardinals sought them in their Ghettos, and begged them humbly to teach them Hebrew. The old prophecy found its fulfillment: many men out of all languages of the nations shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying: "We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you." No greater triumph for Judaism was possible, after all, than this. The higher development of religion and culture in general was only to be gained with the help of the Jews who, in their seclusion, had guarded not only the original text of the Bible, but also its right interpretation. Thus the Reformation and Puritanism are closely connected with the re-discovery of the Hebrew Bible, and thus we can go further and say without exaggeration: Free America is bone of Jewish bones and flesh of Jewish flesh.

But what has Judaism contributed since this time to the investigation of the Bible for which it had itself paved the way? A great son of the Jewish people, Baruch Spinoza in the 17th Century, is the father of modern Bible criticism, but the Rabbis of Holland, still imbued with the fanaticism of their own former Catholic oppressors, did not understand his greatness, and excommunicated him. This narrow-minded procedure may be taken to foreshadow the fact that Bible criticism for the future should be excluded from Judaism.

For a century past, there existed in nearly all languages of the cultured world a science of Judaism, investigating with the means of modern inquiry, the different aspects of the subject. Yet strange to say, the Bible, which forms the cornerstone of Judaism, and the investigation of which should consequently form the very foundation of this science, occupies but a small place in it. The causes of this neglect are easily understood, but are not at all justifiable. It was above all a natural

awe, in applying criticism to so sacred a subject. The same pious reluctance many Christian scholars show with regard to the criticism of the *New Testament*, while they do not fear to criticise the *Old Testament*. But there are still other causes explaining the aversion of the Jews to all kinds of Biblical criticism. I mention firstly a certain lack of independence of spirit we often meet with, at least in the countries of the Old World, in men without any dogmatic timidity and which springs not from the heart, but from other sources. It is the incessant attacks on their existence, their rights and their honor, that paralyze the energy of their spirit, and render them apologists *à tout prix*, unable to lift their minds to the height of critical inquiry. Finally, it cannot be denied that Biblical criticism shows certain features that must offend even unprejudiced Jews. The arbitrariness and inconsiderateness of many a critical author cannot but repel Jewish students, ready and eager to enlarge their spiritual horizon. And besides, what has equal weight, Christian theologians with only a few laudable exceptions, in spite of their often vaunted broadness of mind, are haunted by a deep-rooted prejudice even against Biblical Judaism. Similarly, as orthodox theology regards the Old Testament as the "prediction," yet the New Testament as the "realization," of salvation, *critical* theology regards the Old Testament as only a "precursory stage" of Christianity, and this position is upheld all the more strongly, the more definitely dogmatic Christianity is given up, so that there only remains the one dogma that is to represent Judaism as something inferior.

"But are there really," the antagonists of all criticism applied to the Bible will say, "are there really in this field of research any results tangible and not to be shaken, does it not consist exclusively of questionable problems and unsubstantial hypotheses?" This form of interrogation only shows how little even of the elements of the Biblical science has penetrated into wider circles, and how much it is incumbent on us to demonstrate that the critical investigation of the Bible is not destructive, but has on the contrary done much more in a constructive way. A century of continuous work on the part of eminent scholars of all

civilized countries has sharply outlined in its main features our image of the Bible, its language, its contents, its origin, its ancient translations, its interpretation and its far-reaching influence, as well as of the milieu from which it arose. We can boast today of knowing exactly the most prominent epochs of religious development woven together in the Biblical writings, and, above all, we are able to estimate the importance of the Prophets much more accurately than in former times. We can record such immense progress in the criticism of the sources and of the text as in the exegesis of details, that to deny it could only provoke a smile. Just the past century, too, has supplied us with such a large number of new ways and means for the inquiry into the Bible. Besides the merely methodical means, consisting in the improvement of historical and philological criticism, we possess now a thorough knowledge of all Semitic languages, their literature, religion and culture. But more than all, it is the discovery of Babylonian, Assyrian, Egyptian and South-Arabian antiquity which has infinitely enlarged the horizon of historical contemplation. We can now put the Bible and the religion represented therein into a wider connection. We can divine in what surroundings it grew, whereby it was promoted, and what it had to overcome. Furthermore, we are allowed a deeper insight into the origin of the law, religion and culture of ancient Asia, we realize that there was already a universal culture in the full sense of the word, before there was a Jewish people, and that it is the great historical desert of Israel to have replaced this universal culture, lacking a moral foundation, by a new aspect of life-contemplation and of life-conduct for the individual as well as for the nations. The quarrel about 'Babel and Bible,' which arose in Germany twenty years ago, would not thus have stirred Jewish circles, if they had learned sooner to face facts which they had not yet acknowledged as facts, and had not offered thereby to their opponents a weak spot, and a possibility of a cheap victory, to demonstrate the inferiority of Jewish science.

These are the sad consequences of going around in a wide circle, away from Biblical science, as from a thing liable to

catch fire. This wrong attitude we have cause bitterly to regret. Jewish science has lost here an important position it had held until the end of the Middle Ages, and howsoever unjustifiable otherwise Christian theologians look with disdain upon Judaism, in the field of Biblical research our inferiority to them is a deplorable fact, as to which nothing can deceive us. And thus Jewish youth longing for information must draw on Christian sources, which is not only mortifying, but also dangerous, if it has not a counter-weight in a Jewish criticism. And a further deplorable consequence is the fact that the very study of the Bible in Jewish communities has sunk to a tremendous degree, so that we do not longer deserve the proud name of the "People of the Book."

How must such a Jewish criticism of the Bible look, which we have just declared necessary? For if we happened to receive, instead of a Christian criticism, a similar Jewish one, it would be a precarious gift. For every tendency, either Christian or Jewish, means death to real science. If I am pleading for a Jewish criticism of the Bible, it means only that all riches of thought and feeling deposited in our post-Biblical literature shall be made serviceable for the interpretation and development of the spiritual treasures preserved in the Bible. I dare say, for instance, that the Tannaim understood in many respect the Bible better than any one scholar of today and that therefore the study of their Midrashim, namely, Mekhila, Sifra and Sifre, is an indispensable equipment for every earnest investigation of it. By drawing on Jewish sources, our science will also act more strongly on life, the propagation of Jewish doctrine from pulpit and desk will receive a powerful impetus. Instead of hollow and flat phrases of party-struggle, a spiritual Renaissance will take place. The new Judaism that we all hope for, but cannot yet form a distinct notion of, would spring up, and, as so often in former centuries, we could make a specifically precious gift to the world.

If, according to *Nietzsche*, the taste for the Old Testament is a test of great or small, it is our honorable duty to regain this taste for its external beauty, as well as for its sublime contents,

which we have long lost. Many a Jew, familiar with the literature of all nations, knows nothing of the lyric loftiness of the Psalms and of the enrapturing inspiration of the Prophets, or makes their acquaintance only by the precipitate they have found in the Christian prayer book or in an oratorio. And many a social economist amidst us, learns only from Henry George that the greatest thoughts moving the world and seeming called to give her a higher direction in our time, the ideas considered to be most modern, the ideas of social justice and of universal peace, are derived from the Jewish Bible. This ignorance of all that is connected with the Bible has done more mischief to Judaism than the hateful attacks of its professed enemies, and we must therefore return to its study, as a child that has lightly left its paternal home. After having regained the taste for it, we shall succeed in creating an appetite in the world for it, and to open the eyes of men to the fact that the Bible is the most precious treasure bequeathed to them from the past, being simultaneously the book of a great antiquity and of a distant future.

And what country is better fit for this work, to lead the Jews to the critical investigation of the Bible, and to carry its doctrines to the Gentiles, than this New World, that greets everyone on entering it by the colossal Statue of Liberty, and symbolizes by it the resolution to deliver itself of the prejudices of the Old World? But until this day the Jews of America have not done much work in this field, and I am forced to repeat the complaint of the late Solomon Schechter that he expressed about twenty years ago in the words of the Holy Writ: "Our inheritance is turned to strangers." Only a few Jewish scholars in this country apply themselves to Biblical studies, and it is all the more astonishing, as just the sons of this country seem predestined for this task. A great many of them have come from Eastern Europe, where the knowledge of the Bible in its Hebrew original is still living, and learning is considered a religious duty. In a beautiful address delivered before your Society the late Joseph Jacobs, already in 1900, prophesied: "The future of American Judaism is with the Russian Jew." If time approved this prophecy in general, it is especially true that the future of

our *science* mostly depends on the Russian Jew, and with it the future of this branch of it. They will easily understand that the old commandment referring to the Torah: "Thou shalt meditate therein day and night" has now received a new meaning: thou shalt devote to it a scientific study. Their keen intelligence, combined with their enthusiasm, is a compensation for the philological and historical training that they often lack, and that lack can and must be supplied.

I don't know if you or a great many of you are Zionists. But anyhow you must recognize that Zionism has rendered to Judaism the greatest service by preparing the soil on which a Jewish Biblical Science can grow. It opposed passionately the barren negation of, and icy estrangement from, all traditional Jewish values, and chiefly the indolent indifference to the Hebrew language, and removed by it a danger threatening the thorough investigation of the Bible through a fallacious notion of freedom. There is deep sense in the saying of Rabbi Joshua Ben Levi: "Free is only he who occupies himself with the study of the Torah." The freedom of spirit is only to be acquired by diving deep into the Bible, where all prejudices are overcome by the proximity of God. Let us hope that this degree will be attained in a not distant future by many members of your Society, and that in connection with it also the other promise will prove true: "Everyone that occupies himself with the study of the Torah will be lifted!" May your society be able to raise its members, and by them the whole body of American Judaism, to the highest level of spiritual and moral perfection, and thus become an important factor in carrying Jewish thought beyond this continent, and of shaping the longed for religion of tomorrow.

ATTITUDE OF THE LAST TWENTY YEARS AND CONDITIONS OF JEWISH LEARNING*

BY PROF. ISMAR ELBOGEN

LET me join in my friend's expressions of sincerest thanks for your kind hospitality, which gives me the pleasure to meet a group of prominent Jews associated "for the purposes of promoting and furthering the intellectual and spiritual interests of Jews." That is just what I consider my life's task to work for, better understanding of Jews on that broad, and I dare say, American, platform of *liberty of conscience*.

It is my privilege at home to teach at a college which does not exclude any scientific view or presentation of Judaism, and I was happy to find here, at the newly founded Jewish Institute of Religion, the same spirit and the same freedom of thought. That is the idea which distinguishes the Judaeon, that, concerning all the current disputes and problems, he gives the preference to the strengthening of the spiritual energies of his Jewish people.

The scientific investigation of Judaism inaugurated just a century ago worked along the same lines. Its influence on the development of Judaism, its action upon the great achievements of contemporary Jewry, even of political and social, not to say spiritual and religious, progress, counts far more than is generally recognized. Intellectual seeds ripen slowly, but at the end their products become manifest. When Leopold Zunz in 1822 pleaded for what he called *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, namely, for a scientific investigation of Judaism, he had not in mind to outline a new method of studies to a few professional men. His idea was to make Jewish studies part of general

* Address delivered as a guest of honor at a meeting held November 26, 1922.

education, part of general research, and so to endow Judaism with new energies, with new vitality. According to his view, scientific investigation of Judaism ought to attract that same devotion, which the Jew had shown in days gone by to rabbinic literature. According to his view, the modern Jewish studies ought to become an incensing rejuvenating power, as the study of the Talmud had been among our forefathers.

It is generally known that his hope has never been realized, that when Zunz, after a long literary career died in 1886, he left rather a period of decline in Jewish spiritual life, and the outlook for Judaism was not very bright. To be sure, the famous and fascinating works of the pioneers of Jewish studies were spread abroad and studied as standard books, but instead of inspiring to powerful and vigorous activity, they pressed a heavy burden upon the shoulders of the younger generation. A new generation has new prospects, and looks out from a new point of view. It is the privilege of youth to be ungrateful and disrespectful, to emphasize only the shortcomings of the past, and to underrate its credits. The youngsters about the end of the XIXth Century were led to the view that Jewish Scholarship was but a wholesale liquidation of a rich, maybe a very rich, store of old goods, of great interest to the antiquarian, but not appealing at all to the man of the XXth Century. The younger generation, brought up in the atmosphere of colleges and universities, felt bitterly that Jewish Scholarship kept behind the general progress of science, that we had no publications of fundamental importance and of high standard like all the other branches of historical or comparative studies, that our scholars gave too much time to the discussion of details, even of minutiae of little value, of no interest, that on the other hand, they neglected the main branches of our studies, e. g., Biblical literature, that they had no leading ideas, no great problems, above all, no touch with Jewish life, with the then beginning Jewish Renaissance. Jewish scholarship seemed to be condemned to death. There was no demand for Jewish scholarship, and consequently no offer; whenever a Jewish scholar left his place, nobody was in view to succeed him. In that desperate condition a ray of hope came from

the United States, where, at that time, Jewish institutions of learning were rebuilt, were filled with new spirit, where such a standard work of comprehensive Jewish scholarship as the Jewish Encyclopedia was undertaken.

The first proof of the new spirit dominating the younger Jewish scholars of Central Europe was the foundation of the "Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums," which took place just twenty years ago, in November 1902, and united Jewish scholars of different groups and of different countries for the purpose of rejuvenating and sponsoring Jewish studies. The Gesellschaft had a broad platform, including:

1. the publication of valuable works of Jewish research;
2. the circulation of high standard Jewish books among the masses;
3. the support of young scholars who were able and willing to do Jewish research work.

The Gesellschaft engaged in an encyclopedic series of works on Judaism in all its aspects (*Grundriss der Gesamten Wissenschaft des Judentums*, ss.; Dr. Kaufmann Kohler's "Jewish Theology" in its original German text being one of the volumes); in a publication of classical Jewish sources, in the publication of a scientific monthly, etc. It did not carry out the whole programme, but it did a great deal of good work, and can be proud of its achievements. But I frankly confess that the main purpose has not been reached—the Gesellschaft was not able to train scholars, because it never had at its disposal sufficient means, and it has got only in slight touch with the Jewish masses—rigid science did not appeal to the masses, and what appealed to the masses was not concerned with science, and not acceptable to the scholars. The Gesellschaft could not fulfill all its aims, and fell short of becoming the representative scientific body of Central European Jewry. But it pushed the spiritual revival, which had more remarkable manifestations, e.g., the foundation of the *Gesamtarchiv der Deutschen Juden*, a shelter of old Jewish records, and a center of Jewish historical research, the publication of a valuable series of "Sources and Studies of the History of Austrian Jews," fundamental Jewish historical studies of Jews in

Poland and Russia, the publication of the "Review on Demography and Statistics of the Jews," in the reintegration of the Hebrew publications of the Society McKize Nirdamim, and many similar efforts. It seemed that finally Jews began to realize their Jewish consciousness, to find out where the cornerstone of Judaism lies, and where the strongest efforts were needed. Still many a problem remained unsolved when the famous philosopher Herman Cohen, who for a long time gave his brilliant intellect and his wise counsel to Jewish leadership, a few months before his death (April 1918) with fervent zeal and youthful vigor, pleaded for the idea of an "Academy of Jewish Learning" as a gathering of the best Jewish minds, as a center of organized basic Jewish learning, as an opportunity for learned young Jews to do literary work, and to form "a sort of normal school for future professors."

To our greatest satisfaction we succeeded in surveying the whole field of our interest, an enlargement and deepening of our studies; even in the Biblical branch, our endeavors did not fail so completely as my friend Doctor Perles stated. At least his works and a few similar ones marked the progress in these studies.

Inter arma silent literae. The war interrupted our work, the peace is going to render in vain all our efforts, to break down all our organizations. Under the desperate economic conditions of today, no such institution can exist any longer. It is impossible to balance a budget, when the fluctuation of money is such that in the fall all the expenses are nearly thirty times as high as they were expected to be in spring. Astronomic figures are incompatible with sublunary works.

Now we in Germany face the most critical situation. The Jewish congregations in the eastern provinces, given to Poland, have nearly disappeared; in the western provinces, the small congregations are dying out. First, because it is a general economic tendency to move to large cities. Furthermore, because the small congregations cannot meet their expenses. They are going to have no more Jewish teachers, no more Jewish teaching. The large congregations are increasing in number, but going to lose

their resources of strong Jewish feeling and Jewish learning. In a large community the struggle for life is at its keenest. Last night I received a letter from a young American scholar who is now studying at Berlin; he writes me, "people are still talking about bread and potatoes, and you can't blame them. People with empty stomachs haven't much time for books or operas."

The effect of this cruel situation is a collapse of our educational and scientific organizations. Some have discontinued their activities, others will follow. There are no means to back them.

But the situation is far more critical. German Jewry today is responsible also to a considerable part of eastern Jewry. We had a large eastern immigration, and have to provide for their educational needs. The numerous high schools opened in Lithuania and Poland, where all lessons are taught in the Hebrew language, supply their teaching staffs from German or Austrian institutes. In Russia, since 1905 the attendance at the old Talmudic schools diminished from year to year, and, through the war and its consequences, it became nearly annihilated. To be sure, the neo-Hebrew culture had made immense progress among Russian Jews, and may in time supply that old learning. It is a matter of fact that we are experiencing a similar transformation to that which Judaism suffered a century ago, and just that experience, that crash of Jewish life and Jewish institutions, ought to be a warning to us, not to wait to the last moment.

This is not a German, not a European, problem, it is the problem of to be or not to be of Jewish learning or education, of the salvation of the reservoirs of Jewish intellectual power and energy. Things have reached that dangerous point that, to use a Talmudic expression, many of the European countries are dead, some others in agony. But there are a few still on the sick bed; they can be saved, if the physician and the medicine reach them within the right time. There is but one country able to forward that help, the United States of America, and, just as twenty years ago, all hopes are concentrated on American Jewry.

What American Jewry has done and still does for war relief, is beyond all praise, and deserves to be recorded by the historian of Eastern Jewry. But if we wait, if we don't send help at this

eleventh hour, I am afraid, there will be no more historians of Eastern Jewry. American Jewry has invested all its energy in bodily relief, and has so far shown little interest in spiritual relief work, which is not nearly so expensive. I beg to put before you, ladies and gentlemen, the question of our yesterday's Bible portion:

"Hast thou but one blessing, my father?"

LEISURE *

BY DR. ISRAEL ABRAHAMS

A FEW years ago I called on David Hoffman in Berlin, and found that famous Talmudist stretched on his couch. No, he assured me, he was not sick; but was preparing for his next lecture at the Hildesheimer Seminary. He prepared, you note, by relaxation. What a moral! "Wisdom cometh by opportunity of leisure," said Ben Sira, an older Hebrew sage than Hoffmann. Ben Sira meant by leisure the release from other pursuits, from the world's practical business. We must not too readily accept his view. It is the arrogant prejudice of an intellectual aristocrat. Like Plato, Ben Sira placed the craftsman below the student, the philosopher above the merchant. The Talmud administers a scathing rebuke to so one-sided an estimate of values. Simon ben Yohai, driven into hiding by Roman severity, at length emerged from his cave, and, seeing some ploughmen at work, invoked destruction on them. They were wasting their time in the fields, when they should have been in the schools. Then a Voice from Heaven was heard: "Simon, wouldst thou annihilate God's world? Back to thy cave!"

And yet, while seeing that the world owes at least as much to its factories as to its libraries, that as Gamaliel urged (and Ben Sira really agreed), both are requisites of a moral world, we may also see that the world is too much with us, both in factories and libraries. The man of letters is often quite as deficient in the habit of leisure as is the man of business.

I dare say, however, that you wonder why I dare to talk at all of leisure in this city, the epitome of relentless energies. "Wait," you say, "till you get back to your sleepy Cambridge, and there

* Address delivered as a guest of honor at a meeting held April 29, 1923.

take all the leisure your lazy heart desires. In this wide-awake place you may prate of leisure, but you must go elsewhere to experience it."

Do you, indeed, ask me to remember home from home? I do not forget my Shakespeare. Sentenced to exile and bidden to remember home from home, Bolingbroke demands whether it is possible to

"Cloy the hungry edge of appetite
By bare imagination of a feast?
Oh, no! the apprehension of the good
Gives but the greater feeling to the worse."

I do not need to put this sentiment to the test. For leisure is a quality of the temperament, not of environment. I thank my fate for a leisurely spirit. In vast and modern New York I can be as dilatory and desultory as in time-mediaeval Cambridge. The stars change, not the star-gazer, when he crosses an ocean. The man who has no leisure lacks the disposition to it. Hillel warned people against waiting for leisure; for, said he, leisure may not wait for them. He who has not leisure, always and anywhere, has it nowhere and never.

So, when I am overwhelmed by the racket of this wonderful city, and seek refuge of leisure, I go to the Metropolitan Museum and sit before a picture in Gallery 21. It is Puvis de Chavannes' picture of Sleep—the field is more like a tapestry than a painting, as though the deliberate needle, rather than the rapid brush, had worked. Figures are there in every posture of relaxation—an old man's sheer physical exhaustion, the sensuous yet delicately portrayed abandonment of a youth and a maid in love-clasp, and a mother protectingly gathering her babe to her—both asleep. But the dominating figure is a man in his early prime, with his tool laid aside, and (in that phase which modern psychologists are now telling us is most favourable to vision) half-dozing, half-waking, he rests on his elbows, and his face is placid. Amid them all unknowing, he knows. He has the secret of leisure. Leisure comes from license, to be permitted, to be free. In modern democracies we are free. But this man has not let the boon of freedom evade his soul. I sit before him for a moment,

and I know, too, as he knows, the meaning of the soul's freedom. The soul's freedom—that is leisure.

I fancy that it is the knowledge of this fact that makes many shun leisure. "Know thyself," said Socrates. In "Daddy Long Legs" Judy acclaims the quiet moments of college life as an opportunity for becoming acquainted with herself. "I think I am going to like me," she says, or words to that effect. Do not some of us dread the quiet, unoccupied, moments, because we fear an opposite verdict, that self-knowledge will reveal an unlikeable self? We rush into time-wasting, because time-saving may mean too intimate a knowledge of ourselves. Children are afraid of the dark; we are afraid of the light. If we could, we would strike ourselves off our own visiting lists.

But these things go by contraries. If fear of self-knowledge is an enemy of leisure, so is conceit of self-importance. My colleagues have consoled me by the assurance that things over there are going on quite well without me. This has been a salutary disciplining. The globe rolls on without our push, but our pushfulness makes us leisureless. Much cheap satire on this head is levelled at the American rabbi. It is not his fault that he bears everything, rather is everything thrust on him. He must initiate and also execute. He must be driver in every drive. An old pupil of mine, once a rabbi here, is now a leather dealer. He explained his change of profession: "When I was a Rabbi, my congregation expected me to be their man of business. Now I am a man of business, with this difference, that I get the pay, and at last see my way to the leisure for writing a book or two." This man now works hard, but he also rests hard—not at all a bad way to acquire leisure. I never admired the tortoise. It reached the winning post before the hare, but the hare won more from the race by his side excursions. Has life a winning post at all, and is it not the side excursions that give life its flavour? Samuel Johnson wrote: "Of idleness I am paying the fine by having no leisure." He mistook himself; he was not idle, but intermittent; by turns he worked and rested hard. What he called idleness was leisure, and in this leisure he won fame. The conversations of his evenings have outlived the treatises of his

mornings. The *obiter dicta* of our rabbis have survived, as well as their pronouncements of law. Schechter read a novel a day—was he idle? Perhaps in his leisure, he was maturing his style. Dr. Kohler takes his leisure by reading Dante, but his researches on ancient Egypt have not suffered. Maimonides, unfortunately, though a good worker, was a bad restor; Seneca derided the Jewish Sabbath as loss of a seventh of man's existence. But life is empty without its empty moments; it has no *heshek* without its *nahath*, no charm without its calm. Rabbi Jacob, in the Mishnah, was a dull fellow. He described as guilty against his own soul the man who, on the road, turned aside to admire a way-side landscape. Such a man was saving his soul. Perhaps, however, Rabbi Jacob was merely urging the importance of concentration. Concentration over work is the correlative of leisure from work. We waste opportunity of leisure by working slackly; we take too long over our tasks and so we have no margin left. We saunter when we should move, and so must move when we should saunter.

Hence, we seem to be convinced that we must always be doing something. I play neither bridge nor golf, but I do not consider either or both pastime for a busy man. Mr. Vauclain, the other day, advised you to give up golf for the wheel-barrow. "You get the same exercise, but you have done something." I know a fine, unselfish, man, who takes recreation by helping the grave-digger; he gets his exercise and is "doing something." Oh this futile desire to do something—when we should occasionally be doing nothing, and have leisure to be something! In England the legally enforced, early closing afternoon is one of the causes why, despite the horrors and tragedies of the war, my country was never in a less nervy condition. The manner in which the working classes have learned how to use their leisure is a useful commentary on the fears expressed in anticipation.

You will observe that I have hardly defended leisure as a protest against monotony. To many of us, as has been said, a little monotony would be fine variety. We seek change, not for leisure, but out of discontentment. Bialik's Lezer Mendel, after four year's drudgery as a teacher, seeks escape—by opening a shop. We may predict that before long he will be seeking another con-

tract as a teacher of village boys. I know that my leather dealer is casting a longing backward glance to the rabbinate. It is all very pathetic—but life is pathetic. We can at least give ourselves leisure to realize the pathos, and out of the pathos, snatch some chances of contentment.

But we miss our chances. "New York is so noisy, we can never find quiet," said a friend. We were passing through the fare gates on the subway. "Listen," he said, as he pushed through, "how noisily the very turnstile works." "Listen," I said, "how noiselessly it works," and to his amazement, I followed through with the softest click. This is my chief discovery in New York, that the fare-gates revolve noiselessly—provided that you take half a second longer over the operation. I think New Yorkers like to hear the fare-gates rattle. It makes them feel in such a hurry. Most people, too, want to make a noise in the world, and some get their only opportunity in the subway. Some children were playing at what they were going to be when they grew up. They were making the appropriate noises—that was the attraction of the game. The future engine driver blew and puffed, the future sailor whistled over imaginary ropes, the future fireman clanged a bell. One little boy stood disconsolate. "I am going to be a poet," he said. Then he turned and asked: "What sort of noise does a poet make?"

Now, I believe that there are enough of us here, unambitious of making a noise or doing things, to justify a practical proposal. Let the Judæans seek out a benevolent millionaire who will finance the revival of a good old Jewish institution. Let us re-found the Honorable Order of the Ten Batlanim. If anyone here doesn't know what a *batlan* is, it is not Dr. Kohler's fault, for he has an informing article on the subject in the Jewish Encyclopedia. The *batlan* was a man of leisure—at first an amateur, later a professional. Perez Smolenski amusingly describes (in his Hebrew novel, the "Burial of an Ass") how a city, abounding in volunteer leisurites, nevertheless appointed and paid ten professional practitioners of the art. How much more necessary is this provision of professionals in a place where ama-

teurs are scarce! I offer myself for nomination among the immortals. What would I do for the money? Why, nothing!

“The House of Lords, throughout the war,
Did nothing in particular,
And did it very well.”

No easy thing, this—to do nothing well. We *batlanim* must be experts in this art; so that, as we crawl along Broadway, perspiring crowds shall point us out in reverential envy, and whisper, “There goes a *batlan*,” and catching a momentary contagion of the *batlan*’s repose, slow down and fall into sedate step. Woe to the *batlan* who betrays his office by hustling or doing anything! He loses his license, and is struck off the pay-list. I have really qualified for his nomination. I wrote home recently that I was talking all day and every night, with ne’er a moment for thinking. And my wife wickedly rejoined: “Exactly, that is why I let you go; to give your brains a much-needed rest cure.”

But I fear that you have no intention to provide me with a batlanic sinecure. I must go home for it; indeed, I am more than a little homesick:

“O, to be in England,
Now that April’s there!
And whoever wakes in England
Sees, some morning unaware,
That the lowest boughs and the brushwood sheaf
Round the elm-tree bole are in the leaf
While the chaffinch sings on the orchard bough
In England—now!”

You have similar delights in an American spring, but when I think who it is that is waiting for me in England, you will not resent my quotation from Browning. Later on I may hear and answer a recall to these shores, but now my thoughts are Eastwards. And, of all England, Cambridge is the sylvan gem, for it is a city in the country. Do you know a quaintness about Cambridge? We teachers must reside in term-time—term-time, by the way, covers twenty-four weeks out of fifty-two. We cultivate the art of vacation. How is residence defined? We must sleep five nights a week within one and a half miles of Great

St. Mary's. Nothing is said about being awake for a single day! We are sleepy there, do you say? But we manage to do a little work, after all. Paid for sleeping there five nights a week! Is it not an adorable life?

Yes, said a friend to me, with all your talk about leisure, I know what you will do when you reach home. You will go to the university library, or your lecture halls, or—indeed, I shall do nothing of the kind. I shall go to Fenners. What is Fenners? I wish I could picture it to you—its lawn of green, its fringe of trees, its cosy pavilion, its youths in white, playing cricket—leisurely, a game which lasts three days. To Fenners, then, I will go and, in the words of one of our Cambridge poets,

“Dally with retired leisure
That in trim gardens takes her pleasure.”

We will sit there, sip our afternoon tea and talk of little, but just save ourselves from a deadening staleness. And I will whisper to my colleagues the message that I have brought back from New York, tell of its invigorating seriousness, and try to impart something of that passion for constructive progress which is the glory of America.

THE LESSON FROM TUTANKH-AMON'S TOMB FOR THE JEW*

BY DR. K. KOHLER

Let me first of all express my high appreciation of the honor conferred upon me by your kind invitation to be your guest of honor tonight, alongside of my friend and co-laborer in the field of Jewish research, Dr. Israel Abrahams of Cambridge, England. In addition to what your President said of him, let me say that not only has he earned an enviable name in Europe and America as the author of scholarly and widely read books, a number of which were issued by the Jewish Publication Society, but he, in common with Claude G. Montefiore, created the Jewish Renaissance in England, without which Dr. Schechter's great works might have remained unwritten.

As for myself, I would simply say that with God's help I have attained the four-score years as a לומד, which means a learner, and the four Hebrew letters of which have the numerical value of 80, and that I have been a constant seeker after truth for truth's sake.

As to the choice of my subject tonight, I would state that my motive was not to be up-to-date, but to cast some light on the startling discovery for which the generous Englishman, Lord Carnarvon, had to meet his tragic death, to go down through history as a martyr to science.

My friends! All my life I have believed, and I trust you too, in a divine Providence working in history; and I abhor Max Nordau's view that whatever happens in the world is the result of mere chance and of no fore-ordained purpose, a kaleidoscopic delusion, as religion itself is mere superstition. Read America's

* Address delivered April 29, 1923 at a meeting attended by him as guest of honor on the occasion of his 80th Birthday.

history and dare deny that Columbus, in discovering our Western Hemisphere, was guided by a higher order of things, or Washington when crossing the Delaware. So when Napoleon Bonaparte sailed to Africa on his Egyptian expedition in the year 1798, though he failed to accomplish his purpose of obtaining possession of Egypt and Asia, he was instrumental, without realizing it, in bringing about a greater world-conquest. Standing in the shadow of the great Pyramids, he addressed his soldiers, saying "4000 years of history look down upon you," and behold, in consequence of this expedition, one of the savants of France, with his fine intellectual weapons, conquered the Egypt buried under the sand of 6000 years or more, to open a new vista of the remotest past—Jean Francois Champollion, the decipherer of the hieroglyphics, through the famous trilingual Rosetta stone. Under the spade of wise and indefatigable searchers, wonders of an unknown world of culture, great in art, science, and literature, have since come to the light of day, the mysteries of which baffled Herodotus, Pythagoras and Plato. And today we know the history of Egypt better than that of many a modern land.

And now, thanks to the telegraph and the press, we read with new bewilderment of the dazzling splendor and the undreamt-of wealth of treasures that blazed forth from the opened tomb of King Tutankh-amon of the XVIII dynasty, hidden for more than 3000 years beneath that of Ramses VI of the XX dynasty, in the valley of the tombs of the Kings of Thebes. Marvellous works of art, such as the royal throne, the chariots, the robes, the furniture, and even the toys of the king, are found, all intended to delight his majesty in the life to come; and we are told that a new chapter has to be written about ancient art and culture. All the more pity that thus far we have gained little information concerning the real life of one of the most important epochs of Egyptian history, and we must look forward to the opening of the inner chamber of the tomb, to disclose for us the written documents deposited with the mummy, the contents of which will be of far greater value for us than all the gold and precious stones found by the excavators. Still there is enough for us to ponder over even now.

Our sages tell us that our fathers in Egypt owed their redemption chiefly to the fact that they would not change their religion nor their name. Here you have a king who changed his name and his god, to become one of the most pathetic figures in Egyptian history. The name given him at his birth, or soon thereafter, was *Tutankhaten* which means *The living image of the radiant Sun god Aten* (Adon), and similarly the name of his wife was *Ankh-nespa-Aten*, which means *She lives by the power of Adon*; but he changed his name into *Tutankh Amon* and that of his wife into *Ankh-nespa-Amon*, after the Theban god Amon, thereby proclaiming his return to the chief deity of the priests of Thebes, the Egyptian capital. Yet this very change tells of the most significant *revolutionary religious movement* in Egypt and the subsequent reaction.

The predecessor and father-in-law of Tutankh Amon, originally called Amonhotep IV, was one of the most remarkable rulers Egypt ever had. Unlike the mighty warrior kings of the XVIII dynasty, the Amonhoteps and Thotmeses who preceded him and who, owing to their victorious battles against the Hyksos, the former Sheperd Kings, had succeeded in extending the dominion of Egypt over the various lands in the North and the South, Amonhotep IV was a dreamer, a profound thinker, a great poet, and, while physically feeble, of a strong, independent and determined will, and eager to revive the ideas dominant in the ancient city of *On* or Heliopolis, the city of the sun-god known to us from Joseph's history. Here the sun-disc bore the name of Aten, the Semitic Adon (Adonis). Long before this, Semitic elements emanating from Babylonia had invaded Egypt to such a degree as to introduce the Babylonian language with its cuneiform writing as the international medium, the *lingua Franca* used by the Egyptian kings and statesmen; and so were numerous Semitic deities imported. Probably Amonhotep the IV's mother, the wife of Amonhotep III who was not of royal blood, had exerted some influence on her son unfavorable to the worship of the Theban god Amon. At any rate he became a fanatical opponent of all the gods of the Egyptian Pantheon. He dropped his name Amonhotep and

adopted instead the name *Chuen Aten*, the *Radiance of the Sun-disc* and also gave to his five daughters—he had no son—names ending with *Aten*. He went so far in his religious zeal as to have the name of Amon and the other gods erased from the monuments and replaced by that of his only god *Aten*. But finding himself greatly harassed by the powerful priesthood of Thebes, he moved into another district, the Tell El Amarna, as it is called to-day, and built himself a splendid new residence there, which he called *Hut Aten*, “the Horizon of the sun-disk.” There he erected a gorgeous temple to his only god, besides other beautiful edifices, and rows of obelisks and sepulchres, adorned with fine works of sculpture, the ruins of which still reflect the artistic taste of the ruler. Most interesting, however, is the glorious hymn to the Sun-god which he had engraved upon the various sepulchres. It is over-flowing with praise, for—to quote literally—

“the one living god besides whom there is none,
the former and sustainer of heaven and earth,
the source of light and life, the creator of the Nile in
the nether world.”

The hymn reminds us of the best of our Psalms and stands out unique in pagan liturgy. It closes with the declaration of the king that he, the son and incarnation of *Aten* the Sun-disk, is the founder of the true lore.

It was, indeed, a bold attempt, in defiance of priests and people, to put an end to polytheism, and establish this *quasi*-monotheistic cult as the religion of the land. But see what happened! No sooner had the audacious reformer, the heretic king, died, after his 17 years' reign, than a violent reaction set in. *Hutaten*, the beautiful residential city he had built, was ruthlessly destroyed by the wrathful priesthood and people, the names and the worship of the old gods were everywhere restored, and the new rulers who had come to the throne by virtue of the royal daughters whom they had married, were forced to yield, and return to the old capital of Thebes. As to particulars, we must wait for further information from the tomb so recently unearthed. Most likely the next successor, who had married

Chun Aten's oldest daughter, ruled only as prince-regent for a few years until Tutankh Amon was of age to marry the third daughter, Chuen Aten's second one having died in the meantime. To judge from his statues, he was a weakling, and he died very young, after a short reign of about seven or at most ten years. The government of the large empire was in charge of a capable statesman who made treaties with nations near and far, while the king is represented on the monuments as receiving large tributes from the negroes in the South and from Semitic tribes in the North.

The now famous ruins of Chuen Aten's city in Tell Amarna, discovered about 25 years ago, to the great delight of the historian, have brought to light most valuable records of the remarkable epoch at the beginning of the XIV century before the Christian era, a century and a half previous to the Hebrew Exodus. They have given us an insight into the correspondence the Egyptian kings had in the Babylonian language, not only with the Babylonian kings, but also with the governors of Jerusalem, the sacred centre of Palestine, who from time to time reported to Amonhotep III and IV, their sovereigns, about the Hittites, the Biblical sons of Heth in the North, and—what is especially noteworthy—about the *Abiri*, the Hebrew shepherd tribes inhabiting the desert and the Jordan Valley. There were also found monuments indicating that Tutankh Amon ruled for a short time in this city as Tutankh Aton.

But this was the end of the great religious reform movement. The heretic king was soon forgotten, and every vestige of his bold undertaking eradicated. Even the name of his successor, Tutankh Amon, was obliterated from some of the monuments and replaced by that of his successor, a soldier-king of great valor who led over to the powerful XX dynasty of Setos, Ramses I and II and his son Manreptha, the Kings of the Hebrew *oppression* and of the *Exodus*. Obviously, like all renegades, Tutankh Amon was distrusted and despised, just as are those renegade Jews of to-day who join the Church, but remain aliens, shunned on both sides.

It would lead me too far afield, were I to dwell on the history

of those two kings with reference to our Biblical records. We are concerned here with Tutankh Amon's life story and that of his predecessor, which offers us, I think, a great lesson, which is: No man on earth, however wise or powerful, ever can invent a new religion and impose it on the people, as the inventors of Volapük or Esperanto could not create a new language for civilized humanity. Like language, religion must emanate from the innermost soul of the people, and go through the process of gradual growth in the hearts of men. It is not a matter of the intellect, of mere reasoning. Philosophy is not religion; it must be a living power, the result of inner experience, refined in the crucible of suffering and anxious yearning. If Warburton, the English Deist, and Friedrich Schiller assumed that Moses simply divulged the secret doctrine of the Egyptian priesthood when teaching his people the religion of Jahveh, "the I am who I am," or when scholars of our time assert that Moses adopted the God of his father-in-law Jethro, the Hidianite or Kenite priest, they show a lack of insight into the laws of ethnic psychology. The prophet does not create the God he proclaims; it is God who makes the prophet and inspired teacher. It was in the name of the God of the fathers that Moses spoke, that Isaiah preached, and Hillel and Philo, and, I dare say, also Jesus, taught. As our mental horizon expands, and our ethical concept of life grows deeper and higher, our religious consciousness deepens, and becomes ever firmer and clearer, unless we allow this all-encompassing soul-force to become atrophied, to find us helpless in time of need, of woe and distress.

But my lesson does not end here. When I read the description of those magnificent treasures of art and beauty, of gold and precious stones found in Tutankh Amon's Tomb, deposited there to remain the abiding possession of the defunct King, I could not help comparing it with the tomb of Joseph, whilom ruler of Egypt next to the King. Though he bore the Egyptian title Zophnat Paneah, "divinely appointed guardian of life," he would not rear unto himself a proud sepulchral monument to vie with Egyptian kings, but enjoined his brethren, instead, to keep his bones as a token and

pledge of their future redemption, until they could carry them to the land of their fathers, and put him there in a simple grave. What a striking contrast! Here a land of high culture and a proud civilization, yet at the same time a land of cruel oppression, a house of bondage, with a people enmeshed in magic, in witchcraft, and lewdness, whose religion was a religion of death, whose holy scripture was "The book of the Dead," and whose deities were like mortals, seen buried in tombs, while worshipped as gods, and there a people void of culture and of power and renown, without a land of its own, and yet confidently looking forward to the fulfillment of its destiny, to give to the world a God of freedom, of justice and holiness, a religion of life and of truth.

Most of you have either read or heard the story of our Rabbis: When Moses came to Pharaoh, telling him in the name of the Lord, "Send off My people, that they may serve Me," Pharaoh looked over his large list of gods, and said, "Who is the Lord whom I should obey? He is not even on my list," whereupon Moses replied: "Your gods are all dead or dying gods; mine is the ever-living God, for whom there is no death." Why then, should we be afraid of the Pharaohs or Fords, of the Balaks or Bellocs? We have the divine assurance: "I, the Lord, change not, nor will ye sons of Jacob,—despite all hatred and persecution—ever be consumed." There are those who fear Tutankh Amon's mummy, for the spirits that may still haunt us, and there are others who look upon Judaism as a mummy, thinking its life is long extinct. We behold in Israel's faith, not a museum of antiquity, but a living, forward-moving Power.

DINNER TENDERED TO ISRAEL ZANGWILL BY THE JUDAEANS*

ADDRESS BY HON. SAMSON LACHMAN, *Toastmaster*

TWENTY-FIVE years ago this month of October, our distinguished guest, Israel Zangwill, did us the honor of accepting an invitation of our society, the Judaeans, to attend a Jewish dinner. He was then a youngster with very fine and lasting literary work to his credit; he was not yet a statesman, and we spent a very pleasant evening in his company.

I remember that on that occasion he addressed us on the genius of Judaism, not meaning himself, although it might be well so applied, and he was also at that time particularly interested in his investigation into the reform elements in our religious life on this side of the water, and he seemed to be doubtful as to whether there had been any real advance or any great increase of warmth in the devotional aspects, as compared with those which were depicted in his wonderful novels of religious and home life.

Now he is still frisky, and he showers upon us memorable epigrams as the *Enfant Terrible* having fun with world politics. But we have not come here tonight as Zionists, nor are we anti-Zionists.

We are anxious to meet this great outstanding Jewish figure of the world, and to meet and honor the most delightful of novelists, of essayists, of playwrights, of poets. In every department of literary and artistic effort, he moves us and he captivates us by his original thinking, by the priceless possession of literary style, by his bubbling humor, his warmth of rhetoric, his noble and beautiful imagery, and the magnetic impression he makes upon all of his readers.

*The addresses delivered at this meeting, Oct. 23, 1923, are printed from stenographic reports not revised by the speakers.

ADDRESS BY ISRAEL ZANGWILL

Ladies and Gentlemen: There is a sort of Chinese etiquette that prevails on such occasions. The point is, that the host always runs down the thing that he is showing you. Ah, but this is not the case with dinners. You are the guest; you have to run yourself down, you have to deprecate all that the host has said. If he says, "I present you, ladies and gentlemen, with this great giant," you have to say, "You have made a mistake; I am in Barnum's show, but I am a dwarf." But whether one is a dwarf or a giant, it is not one's merit, I think it is an affair of the thyroid glands, or something like that.

Now, this time, for the first time, I am going to say more of myself than has been said. Of course, I do not know what would have been said, had I allowed the flow of eulogy to go on; it may have been that they would have said things adequate, but for once I want to say things myself. You, sir, have recalled the first dinner ever given to me,[†] and someone told me, "We have had meetings since, but not dinners." But that is also a sad memory to me. The president, the chairman on that occasion, Dr. Henry Leipziger, is dead. The man who spoke of me, was my very dear friend, Judge Sulzberger, and it is a very great pathos to me to come to America just one year, or only a few months, I think, too late to see him again. Then there was also present my very great friend, Loeb, who collaborated with me in Harper's Magazine, and made some wonderful pictures for my "Italian Fantasies," the best and least read of my books.

Somebody sent me this speech of mine at the Judaeans, twenty-five years ago, and I described myself as living in impertinent isolation in the delightful library of Judge Sulzberger. You have to be impertinent in America in order to escape the impertinences of everybody else. You are not allowed one moment's repose, and I take the opportunity of thanking all those various bodies that have asked me to address them, but who have

[†]See "The Judaeans, 1897-9" (Vol. I, pp. 115-138, Meeting of Oct. 24, 1898).

forgotten that I have only one body, and it is impossible for me to be in every place at once, except on the film where, with the aid of a phonograph perhaps, one might manage to achieve ubiquity. Now, when I read that speech I admired it very much; I was twenty-five years away from it. It seemed to me a piece of classic oratory, intelligently showing I had been in isolation, and it laid down views upon Jewish life, Jewish religion and Jewish education which have been very little acted upon, and very little studied. That is the usual result of my exhortations.

Now, tonight my speech will be very different. That night there was hardly anything about myself; it was purely objective; tonight unfortunately, I find I got into a fight which I didn't expect, and I am going to see this fight through, and it keeps me in America. I have sent an S.O.S. signal for my wife.

Now, some of these bodies that can't get me to talk to them, because I simply can't, sometimes touch my heart, and I write a letter to them in lieu of my presence. I did that the other day to a local Rabbi at the great meeting on Jewish education. I was worn out. I left England just about a month ago, and I never had enjoyed one real night's sleep since. Nevertheless, I wrote a careful letter to this Rabbi, giving my ideas of Jewish education. The bulk of this letter appeared in the "New York Times". I thought they had cut it down, but it appears that the Rabbi had not read it all, just the parts that he agreed with he read, and the parts he didn't like, he simply censored; and I warn any other bodies I will never write a letter, except the whole of it is read, or none at all. Because exactly the point of my message was left out. The people just want me to say what pleases them, what they want said, and take no notice of what I want to say.

There had been many attempts made to censor me in connection with my Carnegie Hall speech before it was made. Even on the boat there was a great friend of mine who more or less indirectly wished to influence my opinion, and did succeed to some extent. Ever since I came to Nathan Straus', all sorts of subtle attempts were made to get me to change my ideas; in so far as these other views were reasonable, I gave full attention

to them, with the result of more sleepless nights, and the reason I say that is, that in some paper it was said that my speech was a masterpiece. I don't say it at all. I say it gave me more trouble than anything else I have ever written in my life, and I wanted to be fair to all parties. I am considered an obstinate man, but not at all; I am ready to agree to anything, if it is true, if it is logical.

I want to tell you the history of my coming here. The American Jewish Congress gave me an invitation to come, and say what I liked. I replied that it happened that I had just sent to the press an article attacking the American Jewish Congress for its inefficient handling of the alleged proposition of a state or lands offered to Jews in Mexico. I didn't, therefore, see how I could become the guest of the Congress. Very well; some months passed. The article, attacking them strongly, appeared, and then Dr. Wise wrote again. Well, I was rather touched by that; I said, "That's a *beau geste*," and without thinking, I at once said, "I'll go." But just before going I wrote to him, and I said, "Are you not unwise to have me, when you know my views?" "No," he declared, "my views were what he wanted," but from certain statements that were published about the Congress, I got suspicions again that there was going to be an attempt to blur my views, and I cabled over; I refused to sail, unless I would have unhampered freedom of discussion. And they cabled over that's what they were yearning for. Well, they got what they were yearning for. Now, I want to tell you that I am so uncensorable that the British Government did not succeed in censoring me in the middle of the war. They censored one of my plays, and of course it was performed to large audiences by one of those ways that you have of evading the censor. Then "The Melting Pot" they stopped at the beginning of the war because it was against Russia, and afterwards, when Russia broke away and became a sort of enemy, they allowed it again, and there was a time that I was not allowed to say a word against Russia, and after that, when I was not allowed to say a word for Russia, I said it all the same. I spoke at one meeting. I dealt with the sufferings of the Jews during the war and the attitude of the

government towards them, and a brother of Mr. Chesterton, who was there, said, I "ought to be stood up against the wall and shot." That was in the middle of the war.

So you see I am not easy to censor, and the whole of this fuss was lest I should damage the Keren Hayesod, as if the whole of Judaism turned on the care of the Keren Hayesod. As soon as I came here, some woman journalist wrote me a letter—I was to write to her what were the chief turning points of my life. I knew at once what she meant, that my turning point would be her earning point. I am opposed to autobiography. Only once in my life have I been autobiographed. You will find there is a book published, my first book, in which all the leading English authors beginning with Kipling and Robert Louis Stevenson, told the circumstances under which they wrote their first book. I didn't notice it, but you will probably find it in the libraries, but that is the only time I ever indulged in autobiography, because I believe it is generally fictitious, and if you tell the truth you hurt other people and still more yourself. So I have avoided it. There are some classic examples of autobiography, as Rousseau, for example, a wonderful book, but he didn't publish it until he was dead, and Goethe, when he published his book, was careful to make it a mixture of poetry and truth.

Now, for the first time in my life I am going to indulge in autobiography, because of this fight, that I have gotten into.

And to show you again how little I can be censored—at the age of fourteen as a youthful pupil teacher, Lord Rothschild, who was the head of the school, struck by, I suppose, my accomplishments according to the reports of inspectors, offered to have me leave that toilsome drudgery, to go to Eton, and Oxford, the leading university of England, and he would look after my people. I refused that. Why did I refuse that? Because I felt that I was going to say things when I grew up, and I would not have them controlled by Lord Rothschild. I felt that strongly, and I went on with my drudgery.

At sixteen my instinct was justified. You will find that in the story of my first book. I wrote what was really the nucleus of "The Children of the Ghetto," some of it is in "The Children

of the Ghetto" which was published and sold largely, and the committee of the school were horrified, and they came down with an ultimatum, and I was put in a difficult position, and they said that if I publish anything, I must submit it to them. I said, no, that I would publish nothing. That went on until I was about twenty-one. Then came a great clash with the authorities. I will not say—I do not want to hurt the school now and I have never declared what the quarrel was about, but I resigned my position. Lord Rothschild, then, at a public meeting, declared that I had been dismissed. That is a slander. I could have gone to law and probably recovered heavy damages, but I was a poor youth, I should be up against one of the richest men in the world, and therefore, I simply wrote to a Jewish paper and asked him for an apology. I pointed out he might have been misinformed, he probably was misinformed, but he had only to make inquiries to find out that I had resigned, and that I was not dismissed. Of course, he never apologized, and took no notice.

Then, some years afterwards, circumstances brought me into friendly relations with Lord Suffield. He was a friend of King Edward and had some high position at court, and Lord Suffield told me—he was sitting next to Lord Rothschild at dinner one day—that Rothschild went on about me so vehemently that everybody thought it was a quarrel between Lord Suffield and Lord Rothschild. But I managed to exist, and Lord Rothschild was still troubled with my personality. I took advantage of Lord Suffield's friendship to get him to preside over a lecture I gave on the commercial future of Palestine before a great commercial gathering. Bernard Shaw was present, drawn, he told me, by the sheer fascination of the subject. This was the first time that Palestine had been taken out of the clouds of dreams and myths. There is a full economic consideration of the possibilities of Palestine as a rich country, so when Judge Mack came back the other day and attacked me as a sort of epigrammatist, if you will read that whole paper, you will find that I anticipated all that he now discovers about fifteen years later.

After that, Jewish politics got to such a point that Lord Rothschild actually worked under me. He became a member of

a geographical commission which had the task of passing upon territories that should be submitted to them by scientific experts directed by me. I think it is fine of Lord Rothschild that he should have consented to work under me. It would have been finer had he given me the apology then, but it is also fine for me to think and to feel that a Lord Rothschild owed me something.

The other day, my friend, Dr. Israel Abrahams, whom you have had over here, a very great scholar and gentleman, wrote to me: "You have many legitimate sources of pride in your life, but perhaps you ought to be proud of this, that yesterday our congregation, Claude Montefiore's congregation, consisting of 2,000 men, sang your hymns, translated from the Hebrew." Now, as a matter of fact, I did not feel very proud. I was very tired, I was still writing this wretched address, and I did not care much for that tribute, because I considered that congregation on a logical basis. I can understand Judaism as a national religion, but when it goes away from nationalism I cannot understand its not becoming international. Every other religion preaches to the other parts of the world, and Judaism is also to be internationalized, and that is why I do not take any stock in reform movements that do not go far enough. I was not therefore proud of that, but it set me thinking of the time when I was proud, and it was on this occasion: With the Rothschilds and Mr. Schiff over here, I went into what is known as the Galveston scheme, which was to make immigrants to your country enter by the port of Galveston instead of the Port of New York, and then by distribution, settle in the West, the point being that the Jews in Russia complained that they were in a Pale, cooped in all sorts of Ghettos, and yet they made the same sort of a Pale over here. If they came into New York they stuck there. There was an elaborate arrangement and we put ten thousand souls there, and Mr. Bressler went through there recently, and he said most of them are doing very well, and the great point is that they are attracting others. That was the idea. It was to bring over their cousins, sisters and aunts to them. I read in the year 1921 that of 37,000 Jews who entered New York within a few months, the bulk went into the west. So I think that part of my lifework has been successful, one of the few that has.

This committee is quite different from the Jewish Territorial Organization which I founded; it was quite a different branch, that did not pretend to find a territory, but it pretended to deal with a particular immigration problem. This committee used to meet in Lord Rothschild's offices. Mr. Leopold de Rothschild, a very charming man, but of course accustomed to being always attended by parasites, was the treasurer; I was the president. We met in his rooms, in his great office in New Court. There were the most wonderful cigars which I could not smoke, but which smelled very nicely, and there was also tea and cakes and splendid hospitality. On one occasion Mr. Leopold tried to resent my ruling, and got rather angry after I still said that I, as chairman, ruled so and so, and then he cried out, "You must not be such a tyrant, Mr. Zangwill." Then I felt proud; one of the few times in my life; that a Rothschild should say to me, "You must not be a tyrant." It never happened to them before, that anyone should stand up against them. I just ruled him down to order.

Now, as you know, I was in the Zionist movement, and I was the first person that Dr. Herzl came to in London. He came with an introduction from Max Nordau. He had heard of me, but I had never heard of him then. I worked for him loyally as a perfect slave for a great many years, so it is not true that I am an obstinate person, and cannot work with anybody. When I meet a great person, I know it. I pointed out in the year 1904 that there was going to be trouble with the Arabs. The Pasha Allah of Jerusalem had twice as many people to the square mile as the United States. The Pasha Allah had fifty-two and the United States had 26. I drew the attention of these Zionists to this problem, but they always ignored it.

At the same time, as the Sultan would not give in, would not give Palestine for the Jews, would not give enough money, I then went on with the separate activities of the Jewish Territorial Organization, but it is a great myth that I ever left the Zionist movement, it is a great myth that I ever turned away. The fact was, there was a large minority at the fateful Zionist Congress of 1905, who were not so insane as to throw away a territory like

British East Africa, as indeed it was, and they wanted to form a body to take over the offer from Britain. They said: this is the first time in perhaps eighteen hundred years we have been offered anything; let us take it. You know the Hebrew proverb, "always take." Had they taken it, the value of that land ran up so greatly that the mere profits would have run the Palestine movement. But they would not do it.

Now, there is in your "Nation" this week a very complimentary article about me, much more complimentary to my literary work than Mr. Untermeyer is when you read his letter, and this laments that I wasted so much time. I lament it myself. I believe I could have done better myself for the Jews, had I accepted offers to go into British politics. Had I gone into British politics, I could have done more good for Jewish politics. But that is too late.

I am always called a man of epigrams only. I happen to have brought with me a blue book which was issued by our organization for the Geographical Commission. This Geographical Commission consisted in your country of Oscar Straus and Daniel Guggenheim and Jacob Schiff and in England of Lord Rothschild, and in Germany of Ballin, the head of all the Jews of Germany and a friend of the Kaiser, and Mandelstamm in Russia, and I think the Russian millionaire named Brodsky—all these people were working with me on nothing but the epigrams. There was so much work done by this organization, investigating every territory on earth, and particularly two with scientific experts, that no library is complete without having the geographical results of these investigations. Well, the amount of work done was so great that when I looked at the documents the other day it took me days and days merely to get them into any sort of order. One day I contemplate writing the history of it, because it is enormously interesting, but I spent days merely throwing away, burning things up.

You see, I must have written or dictated at least ten thousand letters. For seven years I dropped my literary work and went down to a city office like a business man. You will find that Mr. Untermeyer tells me I am a child in finance. Such financiers

as the late Sir Ernest Cassell were good enough to commune with me on important possibilities. For instance, in Mesopotamia. I am only going into this to answer the charges that I am a sort of a wild person that comes over to make storms.

Now, this book contains reports and they do not exhaust at all the work we did, because always we were investigating many other countries. They contain reports upon the possibilities of Jewish colonization in the Argentine, Australia, Brazil, British East Africa, Canada, Mesopotamia, Nevada, Iowa, Paraguay, Rhodesia, Tripoli, and I want to give you one specimen of the kind of way we work. There is a long account of how we regard this so-called Uganda—that is one of the greatest myths of history, but you will never get it out of Jewish history. It is not even in Sokolow's history, you never get within a million miles of Uganda. There is an account of how I won over the great Joseph Chamberlain and his companion in Parliament, Winston Churchill, to the idea of giving us not only a plateau in East Africa, but the whole of British East Africa, two hundred thousand square miles for the Jews to administer. That will be part of the history why this scheme was let drop, but I wanted to tell you just a little bit about Canada which we investigated, and the report is written and signed, and four members investigated this. One is Israel Hart and the next person is H. M. Kisch, who had been postmaster general of India, Mr. Spielman, one of the most active working members in the Jewish community, and there is a letter from me to Lord Strathcona, with whom I had several interviews, and this has never been published before, and it is still secret, but I will read you one little bit to show you our methods. There is a special statement by me of my interview with Sir Wilfred Laurier. (Reads from blue book.)

That is the sort of life I took up. Since then Canada has again been begging for immigrants. They have got this mad idea that the population of Britain can feed these tremendous colonies, a quarter of the globe. But it is absolute nonsense. There were at the time I wrote only ten million whites over the great British Empire with its Canada, South Africa and with its Australia, only ten million, and my point was that they should

be sensible enough to set some province apart for the colonists as a sort of Jewish Britannia.

The other day I saw in the papers that Lloyd George had been interviewed about my views. He was highly surprised to find that I had said political Zionism is dead, and he had the kindness to say, "Zangwill is a good old friend of mine." It reminded me of the famous saying of Beau Brummel, the great Beau of the eighteenth century, when somebody said to him, "Are you a friend of the Prince of Wales?" and the Beau replied "So he says." I mean, I would never have described myself as a good old friend of Lloyd George. I mean I have been in contact with him a number of times, but I do not think I should venture to claim friendship. However, I am very proud that he does claim it. Further, I was sufficiently friendly with him that a fortnight before the war, he happened to invite me to breakfast at his house, and then, although I do not like to say anything of private conversations, yet I find that everybody including Lloyd George, now tells everything that happened during war time, and so, I am going to tell you some things, and when things become historical, I think you have a right to say them. It is generally understood you have a right to say them only when the people are dead. That is a very useful rule, because they cannot contradict you, but it is better to say them when the people are alive. Now, in the course of this breakfast, many topics were discussed, but the point I want to tell you now was, that I said to him, "Of course, I take it for granted,"—he was then by the way Chancellor of the Exchequer, not Prime Minister—I said, "I take it for granted that if there is any possibility of a Jewish autonomous state arising, whether in Palestine or anywhere else, it would have your sympathy," and he said, "Certainly." It happened that immediately afterwards there was a meeting of my organization, and I told them that, and it is recorded in the minutes to witness if I lie. Therefore, you see, I had begun already before Dr. Weizmann to get Lloyd George's sympathies.

Now, as soon as the war began, Great Britain began to feel the need of every possible help and every possible propaganda

in its favor, and it summoned together all the authors of Great Britain, and asked them for suggestions, and they said they wanted the authors to use their literary power to help the cause, especially against Germany. Mr. Masterman, who was the Colonial Under Secretary then, presided over the meeting, and especially spoke to me and he said, "I am happy to see a representative of your great race." Well, these authors proved rather a mum lot, they had very little to say; they had not had the experience of politics which I had had with my Jewish territorial organization.

So as nothing was forthcoming, I got up and I said: "The Germans, the other side, of course said all sorts of things against England, which are untrue, but they are saying one thing which is certainly true, namely, that England is in alliance with disgraceful Russia." You will remember the state of feeling in wartime, and what it takes to say such a thing as that. "And so, if you want to get the sympathy of the world, if you are going to say that you are fighting a battle for democracy, for righteous ideals, you have got to straighten out your position with Russia." And what I suggested was this: That Sir Edward Grey, the foreign minister,—it was the Foreign Office that had called this meeting; I said: Sir Edward Grey, if he wants to get the sympathy of America and of the Jews of America, and if he wants America to ultimately help us, and come into the war, Sir Edward Grey must write a letter to the Czar, and must say at once, "You must, if only as a war measure, to help us, you must emancipate the Jews of Russia by one swoop."

Well, that seemed to be a sensible suggestion, and the whole of the British intelligentsia, the whole of the authors of Britain, passed a resolution that Sir Edward Grey should be asked to do this, and they were writing down this resolution that Sir Edward Grey should be asked to do this sort of noble thing, that he should ask the Czar of Russia to emancipate the Jews, and I would not allow it to go down in that form; I would not allow it to go down as an act of nobility or justice to the Jews. I had it put down because of the service of the Jews. The Jews were a people of journalists, because they were writing in the press all

over the world. It was for that reason that the Jews were to give as much as they got,—the Jews were able to help in the war, and I got the resolution all ready, and it was expressed in some such form, that Sir Edward Grey should present it to the Czar, because the Jews could do something to help the war, and in that form it was carried, and to my surprise, the Foreign Office printed the whole of the thing and sent it to me in a document marked "Confidential." And some years after the war was over, I said, "Is it not time to produce this document?" And they gave an evasive answer, and I do not see why it should not be known that the Intelligentsia of England were in favor of emancipating the Jews, and I want it known that Sir Edward Grey, who is as weak a man as my friend Samuel of Palestine, was not able to write a letter in sufficiently strong terms to make the Czar of Russia do this. He did not have what your Roosevelt had, this shirt sleeved diplomacy. They were afraid somehow, somehow these diplomatists are afraid, and they didn't put up the struggle, and I am quite sure if the Czar of Russia had come out with that ukase, if instead of abolishing vodka, he had abolished all the restrictions against the Jews, he would have done better, and I believe that America would have come into the war much quicker, and a lot of slaughter and waste of life would have been saved.

I think with that action of mine I drew the attention of the British government to the value of the Jew, to the value of Jews in propaganda, and when there came a dark moment of the war, somebody had the cleverness to say, "Well, the Czar won't do this, or it is too late," I think then they got this idea of what you call the Balfour Declaration, and I think then that Dr. Weizmann to whom they came—he didn't go to them, they came to him—had all the trumps in his hand, and he played a very bad game.

At the beginning of the war, Dr. Weizmann came to me, and asked me—he was not then leader; he was an important figure, but he was not the leader,—he came to me, and he said, "The organization is broken up now through the war; it is in a bad position. If some chance occurs or other that we want some-

body of some prestige in England, will you not take over the leadership?" There Doctor Weizmann was absolutely unselfish. He had no idea of course that he would become leader. He asked me out of real, genuine, interest in Palestine, to take over the leadership. I replied, "I am not *persona grata* with a great many of the Zionists; they don't like my ideas and my organization. If I were to say, 'yes, I will take over the leadership,' it may only split the organization still more, but if you would like to, take counsel among them,—you seem to have done this off your own bat. Get international opinion, find out whether my coming would split the party, or whether it would really fuse the party, then I will give you my answer."

Well, I never heard any further from Dr. Weizmann. He seemed to have found some possibility of going on, and apparently he then thought he could dispense with my assistance, and I heard nothing directly further until about a week before the Balfour Declaration, Sokolow and the Russian leader Isehlenow came down to me and brought me a copy, but then it was too late to do anything. Had they asked my assistance earlier, I am sure I would have got a real document, but they did not ask my assistance. Nevertheless, I tried to make the best I could of a bad job, and I went on the platform and spoke at their meeting, welcoming the demonstration.

After my speech the other day, it had been cabled over that Dr. Weizmann said my speech was a betrayal of the Jewish people; it is one of these cheap, romantic things that people say on those occasions, but, as matter of fact, I was the only one who guarded the interests of the Jewish people, because when this Balfour Declaration came out, it was in the middle of the war, and it took no notice of the interests of the Austrian or Turkish or German Jews. What a terrible situation for the Austrian, Turkish and German Jews! Now, my speech was given in the presence of Sir Robert Cecil, Mark Sykes and various other government representatives, and I brought out this point very clearly, and I will read you just a little passage from the speech. It begins with a reference to Lord Morley, the great statesman who has just died, and who was then Secretary of State for India,

and it says: "I do not come to the government, as Lord Morley tells us the Kaiser came to him, with the marks of Oriental salaams; I don't come to the government like that, for I have long maintained that after a war for liberty and the rights of small nations, this very country, namely Palestine, was due to that scattered and devoted people, which had bled and suffered with all the belligerents, and as an English-born citizen I am proud that my country by this pro-Jewish manifesto, has wiped out the stain of her alliance with the foreign Russian Pharaoh."

You see, I always rub it in. But I said, "Whatever the general Jewish gratitude for this extension of the principle of nationalities, the Jews in Turkey and other now enemy countries are as loyal to their fatherland as we to ours, and we who stand here can have no claim to pledge the race to any power or powers."

You see, I guarded the interests of those Jews in the enemy countries, and they didn't think of that, and no one else did then. So I ask, who betrayed the Jewish people, I or Dr. Weizmann?

I spoke several times at that time. I paid ample tribute to Dr. Weizmann and to Sir Herbert Samuel. I had no quarrel with them. I was very glad that Weizmann should shoulder this job, and that he could do this great work. But there came a moment when he was asked to sign a paper which took away nearly all of these rights. It was already bad enough that they talked of a Jewish national home in Palestine, considering Palestine as a Jewish home, but then they wanted to take away even that, and they said that all we meant was: there is a Jewish nationality already in Palestine; it is sixty or seventy or eighty thousand souls, and they wanted to develop that. Well, you hardly wanted a Balfour Declaration for that. Any Jews could have gone in and joined that. So the whole thing was whittled away. They never came to me at any time when they were in a crisis. They never said, "Look here, Winston Churchill puts to us this ultimatum. What shall we do?" Never consulted me at any point.

On the platform at that great meeting that I spoke of before, I met a gentleman, and again I had a proud moment, for this

gentleman said to me, "You have forgotten me, Mr. Zangwill, Lord Robert Cecil." Well, I was rather proud that Lord Robert Cecil should have to recall himself to me. When lately I went to the League of Nations at Geneva to talk with Paderewski about the Jews of Poland, I again met Lord Robert Cecil, and this time he greeted me "My dear friend," and again I was proud, because Lord Robert Cecil comes from the oldest English nobility, not only was his father prime minister, but his family goes back to the reign of Elizabeth and earlier, and I, after all, was only the son of a Russian peddler, and that he should call me "My dear friend" did give me a thrill of pleasure. Nevertheless, I proceeded to lecture him, and I told him that he was not running the League of Nations strongly enough; that he was considering too much what other people said. I said, "You have got to look beyond England and the people here; that all the peoples of the world are yearning for this period. You could be a Wilson, only a successful Wilson." And then I told him that if one force was coming down like that, and another force meets it like that, the result will be the diagonal; the result of these two forces smashing into themselves like that, is that neither of them will be quite successful, but the line of movement will be in between the two. If this one smashes this way, and that one smashes that way, and if this thing gives a wobble before it gets there, you won't get it in the middle; you will get a less result. I said, "That is what you are doing; you are considering the other party too much; that's what you have to do with the League of Nations; you must go strongly for what you think and you must not consider what other people think." So I say, that when they signed this white paper, none of you in America seemed to know anything, you never read anything. I have all the documents, I have with me the actual mandate; I have the White Paper, I take great care to get all these documents. When I said political Zionism is dead, it was because even at the best, even with the Balfour Declaration, Weizmann, as a chemist, gave us not political Zionism; as a chemist he gave us an *Ersatz*. That was not what I worked for; I worked for a Jewish state; I wanted the Jews to cease being the one exception among all the

racess of the world. I know some of you don't agree with me, but this present-day Zionism reminds me of the melancholy menu that I have in my hotel; it says, "Cocktail type, Champagne type, Beer type." That's the sort of Zionism they gave me, and therefore I declared political Zionism was dead. That is what I meant. That there was no possibility now of forming a state in Palestine, where the Jews will dominate the whole thing from above, and also govern it from above. Herzl is dead. Nordau is dead, and I am nearly dead.

My whole objection to Weizmann and Samuel is that they are the right men in the wrong place; that is to say, at the beginnings of creation, the political creation, you need a certain roughness, you need rather violent types. The British Empire was never built up by Herbert Samuel or Weizmann; it was built up by rather rough adventurers. While England proceeded, she took care to keep what they got for her. That was the case with Warren Hastings and with Clyde, who were impeached. They won the English Empire, and they both had a very bad time, but England got India. Weizmann and Herbert Samuel are splendid in the second stage, after you have got through the initial stage, that is, the violent stage. They are too civilized for their present job.

I will not deal with Lloyd George's criticism of what I said, because I am hoping to get in touch with him either here or in England, and since he presses his friendship upon me, I shall get into touch with him, and give him my views. I knew Lloyd George enough, not to have tried to get behind Weizmann and Sokolow, and interfere with their negotiations, knowing that the trouble in Jewish history is, that someone always tries to interfere with what other people are doing; he would come in as an enemy. I simply stood aside, and let them run the show. The only time I went to Lloyd George during the war was on behalf of an anti-gas fan, invented by my wife's stepmother, which proved of great service in saving hundreds of thousands of British soldiers from destruction. That is the only time I used my friendship with Lloyd George—to obtain the saving of life. But this I will say: That I challenge Lloyd George that he did not mean a Jewish

state. That is what he meant at first; he meant the Jews to have a Jewish state in Palestine, because at that moment there was nationality in the air, all sorts of states were being reborn, unfortunately, some of them have turned out very bad and worse than the countries that are supposed to have persecuted them—Poland, for example, but all these little countries are terrible tyrants. At any rate Lloyd George at that time meant a Jewish state, and people still think so. The confusion is so great that President Coolidge the other day, when he sent a message to the American Jewish Congress, said he sympathized with the idea of Palestine as a Jewish home land, but that is not what is offered at all. That has been long whittled down, even in the Balfour Declaration. It is like having a room in this hotel, and not having a Jewish hotel. So they keep on playing with this double meaning, as if the whole thing were a crooked game, as if the whole thing was drawn up by shady lawyers.

I come now to the Palestine Weekly—the New Palestine. You know that, although the Congress was so against me, at the very end it accepted all my ideas. It says: "It is not betraying a secret to say that the Palestine resolution adopted at the last session of the American Jewish Congress did not express Mr. Zangwill's views upon the situation." It is not betraying a secret, no, but it is telling a lie. It is very fortunate that I kept a copy of my resolution; it was a mere accident, and with the exception of one or two words, things which they have taken out,—the clause, for instance, about having constitutional government, which they took out, and quite rightly because it is too important for them to pass, because it is a thing that the Zionist leaders should think of,—but the rest, every word, is my own. I have got my resolution, and their resolution, and I challenge them to print the two side by side. To my great surprise they threw over their resolution, and they passed my resolution in nearly my own words, and the impudent attack that the Congress was not carried away by me, is really such mendacity that one wonders what they mean when they say that the law shall come out of Zion!

I am now coming to my friend, Mr. Marshall. Mr. Marshall

has quite misunderstood what I said about the Jewish vote. I guarded myself, and these words have not appeared in print. I said: by a Jewish vote I do not mean a vote for Jews. I said: there may come times when the Jew, like every persecuted minority, may need his vote for self protection, and as a religion he also needs it for self-expression, just like the "Non-Conformists" vote in England. Now, when I talk of the Jewish vote, it is borne in on me that Mr. Marshall, like Mr. Untermeyer, has lived in America all his life, and does not know that there are no Jews in America, racially speaking. That is, I have just come to America, and I had to fill out a Government paper with my race and the word "Jew" is not in the government paper; it is the word "Hebrew." Therefore, when I talk about the race, I mean the word "Hebrew"; when I talk of the Jew, I mean the Jew as a religion, and I cannot understand the gentlemen, who say we may not have sometimes the need of expressing its ethical conceptions by a vote.

Then with regard to self-protection you have the Ku Klux Klan against you. Have you not got the right to vote for any protection against this organization? Again, you have this Ford campaign. Suppose Ford is put up for President. Do you mean to say that the Jews of America have not got the right to stand against this slanderer? It is ridiculous. You see, all your papers here have got wrong names. The "American Hebrew" accentuates race, when it wants you to forget race, and "The American Israelite," again accentuates race, when it wants really a sort of reform spiritual Judaism. The "Jewish Exponent," on the other hand, is rather for Zionism, when it ought not to be, according to its name. You must really get these things cleared up. That's why I came here to help you.

But the thing that has most caught me as hard in these criticisms is Joel Blau, whom I admire, and who is said to be a second Zangwill. He treats me in that silly vein as the *enfant terrible*, and in the same number he has got a most profound article upon the power of man to transform the external world by his own ideas and aspirations; but the truth is that every romantic dream is not true. If imagination produced truth, all

of us would accept Jesus. We say the Madonna is a beautiful myth, but we don't follow it. You have got to bring reason to bear on a situation such as a deep intuition of what you feel Zionism is. But I said this, when I read the article of Blau. "*Et tu Brute!*" But I leave all my critics to answer one another.

I remember Doctor Herzl writing me a letter in which he said: What a leader should do is to cause a slight discontent among every section of his followers, but I cause a large discontent among every section, but then they are not my followers, and I am perfectly satisfied not to have any followers. I always agreed with Ibsen and Dr. Stockton: "the strongest man is he who stands most alone."

I see some crank has been lecturing about me; and he said, "Zangwill is a Jew only in name." Well, if you will allow me to make a little pun, if he had said, "Only in aim," he would have been nearer the truth.

When you talk of the religion of Judaism, I want you to practice it, not to take it as a weapon against the Zionist, not as an excuse for being a Zionist. Let us get rid of the anomaly of being like the gypsies who have no state. I don't want these things half done. I want clearness. I can't understand why some of the Reform Rabbis coquette with Palestine. Why should they? I mean, they say it is spiritual; it is apart from any territory. I remember that in the Bible was a profound lesson that Moses' body was buried, nobody knows where, so that we shouldn't make one of these shrines and worship the mere spot. I say that is a fine conception. Let us have the one conception, or the other, but let us have both of them united in Palestine; but for God's sake, make up your mind which it is going to be.

Now, I will end with two sporting offers: The first is to the Keren Hayesod. Some say I came here to damage it; I have already proved to you that I have not damaged it. I hear Dr. Weizmann is coming over here; I am sure he is not in a panic, but he knows this is the moment to pick up the dollars. He is coming over, and he will get more money. Now, my sporting offer is, that before I leave America, I will lecture on some non-controversial subject in any hall not too great or not too full of

stupid people; I will lecture without a cent for the benefit of the Keren Hayesod, and they shall take all the money.

The second sporting offer I make is that I would like all the leaders of the different sections of Jewish life here to immediately come around the table to discuss their positions. I believe that when this subject is studied carefully, it will be seen there is a niche there for everybody, there is a perspective of the situation, and there is a place for everybody and there is no reason for quarrel whatever. There is a place for Zionist, and a place for anti-Zionist, and everybody can really be united, and I believe I can convince them. I do not believe in these set debates, where a man gets up, and then another man gets up, and entirely ignores what the one man has said, or in the weekly correspondence in journals, where the answer has been given a week later, and I have not read what was said beforehand. But if you have honest leaders around the table, you will accomplish a great deal. My friend, Mr. Louis Marshall, I am absolutely convinced of his honesty and sincerity, and other leaders like that. That reminds me, I had brought before me the correspondence that Mr. Marshall had had with Governor Harding of Iowa, and I have read that with the greatest admiration. I thought it was a masterly plea, protesting against the silly idea that you cannot teach foreign languages even as a war measure. Perfectly idiotic, I mean, this stunt against German. Why, if Germany is to be your enemy, the more you know of her language, the better. We have suffered very much in England, because our Turkish Ambassador could not speak Turkish. He didn't know Turkey was going into the war; he never let us know. The Chief Rabbi told me you have here an expression that so-and-so is of an ambassadorial rank. I feel that if we had such a man as Mr. Marshall as the leader of Zionism, the thing would have gone much further, because he has boldness, he has power of expression, he is really not afraid; he says what he means. That is what we have not had in the Zionist movement. Therefore, my second offer is, I will give up time, if such a conference can be arranged. I will meet all the leaders and see if we cannot get some amity into Jewish life here, because you are the controlling factor in the

whole situation, and that is really why I came here and why I am talking tonight.

ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS MARSHALL

FOR a time this evening I feared that I was no longer a friend of Mr. Zangwill, but I find that he has here not been afraid to acknowledge openly that he is my friend, and I wish to say that I have been his friend for more than 25 years, and no matter how much he may charge me with being guilty of being a Grand Duke or a believer in martial (Marshall) law, nothing can ever change our friendship or my friendship. I have had the greatest admiration for him, and have still. I have always respected and honored his sincerity, his intellectual honesty, which is indeed a rare quality to possess; I have admired him for his great literary qualities, for his marvelous contributions to the happiness and to the instruction of all who read the English language, for the characters that he has created, for his profound wisdom and his grace and elegance of diction. I have not always agreed with everything that he has said—

Mr. Zangwill: I haven't, either.

Mr. Marshall: I was about to suggest that. — or his theories.

It would be a very sad world if we were all alike and built according to one last, and had only one point of view. The world is interesting because there are in it men who have the capacity that Mr. Zangwill has of stirring up the animals, and of creating thought, of stimulating ideas.

I feel very proud. Mr. Zangwill told us things that made me feel intensely proud, and by the dedication to me by him of that masterly versification of Ibn Gabirol's great poems, including the *Keter Malkut*, he has brought to me a kingly crown, a royal crown. I consider that of much more importance than the ducal coronet which he pressed upon my brow.

In his speech in Carnegie Hall, after having said that I practised "martial" law, he also said that I was the Grand Duke of

American Jewry. I didn't know what he meant by Grand Duke. You all know how mild mannered a man I am. I once in a while have differences with others, but it is never in the style of a Grand Duke. When I read that, I was very sorry that I could not have heard his speech, for I was out of town that night. When I read that speech during the watches of the night of my return, I read it in *The Jewish Exponent*. I wondered what he meant by calling me Grand Duke. I felt very much as one of my clients did about 25 years ago; he had had a very bitter controversy with his partners, and the matter had gone into the courts and his partners had sought for a receiver of the organization. In their affidavits in support of their contention, they said that he was a hypochondriac. When he read that affidavit he was stunned—he is not a literary man. He said, "What is that they called me?" I said, "A hypochondriac." "A hypocrite?" "No, a hypochondriac." "A hypochondriac? Well, ain't that awful? That's the most terrible thing I ever heard of. What in the hell is a hypochondriac?"

Well, I felt about the same way, but, after all, I knew there was no motive behind it; I knew that it meant that Mr. Zangwill did not believe in any methods except the democratic methods. Martial law was banned, even though Marshall law is the best brand of law we have in the United States. Our constitution was expounded by a man by that name, and we are always proud to find Marshall law behind it.

Mr. Zangwill's idea was that in this country, which is on a democratic basis, everything would have to be done by a plebiscite. The people would have to be called together to vote for their representatives to meet in convention, and there to determine things. And I had just been guilty of a crime against that method of doing things, because I had invited a number of people from all parts of the United States to attend a conference to see what could be done to help the Jewish Theological Seminary of America to get an adequate endowment to carry on the work of Judaism, not Zionism, Judaism. Mr. Zangwill thought that it would be an easier way to raise money by first electing delegates to a convention, and then having them come together

for the purpose of voting the amount of money that they would give us for this work. Mr. Zangwill, as the creator of the King of the Schnorrers, should have known that this is not the successful way to raise money or of schnorring. His hero, no matter how gifted he was in the art, would never have thought of calling together the people in his community on Friday afternoon to vote as to who should give him his dinner for the following Shabbes. That is, I suppose, the reason why I have been denominated a Grand Duke. Now, Mr. Zangwill, we in the United States are numbered somewhat over three million Jews. We are happy here; we are contented with conditions. Oh, of course, there are Fords and Ku Kluxers! We do not care for them! We never notice them. If we do, we are committing a great mistake. We rely upon our fellow Americans to protect themselves and their honor and the honor of our country. We rely upon the Protestant Church to fight against those who are trying to create dissension against the other religious faiths. That is our American theory of government, and that is the American method, and I am proud of it. We require no Jewish vote for any purpose whatsoever; we do not require it in order to protect ourselves, because we vote according to our party lines, and vote irrespective of what our religious faith may be. We may have our own interests; we know how to protect them at the polls; but to form a Jewish political party, to segregate from the great body of American citizens, any section, any faction, and to call it a Jewish vote, or an Irish vote, or a German vote, or a Catholic vote, is to be guilty of treason against this Republic.

That, Mr. Zangwill, is what I meant when I took issue with what I understood to have been one of the utterances contained in your speech. I have seen your interview, published in today's "World," which takes a different view altogether, and which I consider to be a clear statement of the principle which we would all consider, that we must, of course, as decent men, protect ourselves through our regular political channels, through our political parties, by using our influence against those who are our enemies and who are seeking to destroy us.

I welcome the suggestion that we should meet in conference. I am not interested in quarrels. I believe that the thing that we require, not only in American Jewry, but in the Jewry of the world, is the same thing that the whole world requires today—unity, harmony. That is the great desideratum; and it does not help us to have factions, to have controversies, to have contests, which only lead to injury to the great cause which we have in mind, the great cause of Judaism. That is the supreme need of the Jewish people.

Zionism is a theory; anti-Zionism is folly. We are here to study every movement which makes for the benefit and for the welfare of the Jew. In this recent controversy I felt, when I read of it, very much like the woman whose husband in the pioneer days got into a contest with a bear in front of the cabin. She wanted to see fair play, so she said "Go it, man; go it, bear!" When these controversies take place, that is about the way I look at it. They are unnecessary; they are harmful. Let us be peaceful and united. We have enough to do to keep aflame upon the altars of our faith the fires of Judaism.

Now, Mr. Zangwill, we all here are your friends every one of us. We are your admirers; we love to read every line that you have written; I have read and reread practically every line that you have written. We feel proud of you; you are one of the great men of Israel. We hope that we shall not be obliged to have these controversies. Let us avoid them; let us be peaceful, and we will have happiness, and that which we have aimed for all these years to perpetuate, our faith and the glories of our literature, will be accomplished. Mr. Zangwill, we extend to you our friendship and our loyalty and our fealty.

ADDRESS BY HON. HORACE STERN

I need scarcely say that I am deeply indebted to the Judæans for the opportunity which they have given me of attending this function this evening. I was but a young lad, I was nothing

more than a little shaver, when "The Children of the Ghetto" first appeared, and you could imagine how a boy's heart, especially a Jewish boy's heart, was enthralled with the tenderness and pathos of that life in the East End, and how I felt with Sugarman the Shatchen, and how I sobbed bitter tears with little Esther Ansell, as she sat brooding in that garret at No. 1 Royal Street, her soul filled with a vague, tender poetry, and penetrated by the beauties of Judaism. Until then we had had only the rapacious Shylocks and Fagins on the one hand, and the colorless Sundays on the other, but here for the first time were real living, throbbing Jews and Jewesses that we knew, filled with love, affection and sorrow. Then to my very young manhood came Heine on his Mattress Grave, the Maker of Lenses coughing in the dank air of Amsterdam; the People's Saviour and others.

So you see it gives me a real thrill of pleasure; indeed, I might say, that it is the realization of my boyhood dream, that tonight, thirty years after that first introduction to the creations of his wonderful genius, I should be able to be here near the side of Israel Zangwill. And, as the Toastmaster has said, Philadelphia has some claims on Mr. Zangwill, and perhaps it was just that your committee should have wanted someone over here from Philadelphia, because not only, as has been said, did the Jewish Publication Society, which has its home in Philadelphia, bring out the first of Mr. Zangwill's books here, "The Children of the Ghetto", and not only, as has also been said, was a recent publication, his translation of the poems of Solomon Ibn Gabirol, published there, but as Mr. Zangwill referred to earlier in the evening, Philadelphia had another claim upon him. I think he himself once said that he considered it the most interesting of cities because it was the home of Judge Sulzberger.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, there is scarcely any pleasure, if there be any in this world, that has not with it some little alloy, and tonight is no exception, so far as I am concerned. Any person coming from the peaceful and provincial Quaker City would naturally feel a certain kind of diffidence in addressing

an audience in this wicked metropolis, and, in addition, there is a peculiar fear which I may say clutches at my heart this evening.

I read in the papers a few days ago that the dear, able, chairman of the American Jewish Congress, in a speech before that body, in contrasting its personnel and development with that of a certain other organization, referred to the latter, as I remember his words, as being a nice, small, safe, tight, self-appointed committee, adequate and even perfect in its own sight. I have not the least idea to what committee he referred, but I do know that I am a member of it. And being such a member, I think it might be a bit dangerous to come here to this city, which has but recently witnessed and held the sessions of the great Jewish autocracy. I am afraid that perhaps to be a member of a non-elective committee and to work for Jewish causes with such autocrats and usurpers and Grand Dukes as Mr. Marshall and Mr. Cyrus Sulzberger and Dr. Adler and Mr. Rosenwald and Mr. Oscar Straus and a few other Jewish Hohenzollerns and Fascisti, might stamp one over here as an enemy of the people. On reflection, however, I assume that there is no danger, because, although I referred to Philadelphia before as being a peaceful city, we also have had sessions of the American Jewish Congress. They were not addressed by a Zangwill, because there are no other Zangwills, but even at that they were not dull. And they discussed every Jewish subject in the world except, possibly, Judaism. I think we Jews have a fondness for organizations, especially if they have grandiose names and statements and purposes. The newer they are, the more attractive they seem, and the more they are, the greater the illusion they give us of progress.

And we join them, and have delegates, and if the delegates are to be elected, we vote for them; that, too, gives excitement to life. The way we join these organizations reminds me of a story of two gentlemen in a smoking compartment of a Pullman car, and one asked the other whether he would like to buy a fine Pomeranian, and the other man said "Yes, have you got one?" "Yes." "How much do you want for it?" "I will sell

it to you for one hundred dollars." At that moment, a Jew who was over there in the compartment, came over and said "I beg your pardon, do you want to buy a Pomeranian?" "Yes." "I can sell you one for \$95." The man said, "Is it a good one?" and he said, "Yes, it is a fine one." He said, "Well, I will take yours." At the next station the Jew got out and sent a telegram to his partner, "Have just sold a Pomeranian. What is it?"

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I must confess, of course, that I cannot and did not intend to discuss at this late hour, or even at an early hour, anything in the nature of the problems that have been dealt with here this evening. I am a little bewildered, I may almost say a bit groggy, in passing the evening in the company of Winston Churchill, and Lloyd George and Sir Edward Grey and the German Kaiser, and other people who pass around the streets of London, but who never find their way to Philadelphia.

And I do not feel that I am able to discuss anything of that kind, But I cannot help wondering, interesting as these subjects are, whether, if the great genius of Mr. Zangwill, as in his remarkable and brilliant speech before the Congress, conducted his hearers in an aeroplane and took with them a survey of the whole Jewish world, I cannot but wonder if that same genius, with his remarkable ability as a sky pilot, could conduct us just a little over our own American Jewry and look down upon us to see exactly where it is that we are, not perhaps entirely under the glamor of this great international situation; I wonder where it would be best for us to focus our attention. And I suppose, if that aeroplane went around merely in America, as in ancient Greece, it would have studied its works of art, and as in Rome it would have turned to its law and political organization, I assume that that aeroplane with us would first hover over our religious institutions, and it would probably start with the Jewish Theological Seminary of New York and the Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati, and I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, coming down, as I said before, from the consideration of these interesting subjects to something a little more homely: Do we find there anything that gives us cause to be proud as a so-called religious people?

The Seminary is struggling for a few dollars to enable it only to exist, much less to function to the best advantage. The Hebrew Union College is supported by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and is now working day after day for some plan of maintenance which will enable that institution to continue to function, and not depend on communal institutions which are characterized more by the way they fall off each year than in any other manner.

Just think of it. Here is one institution which is almost a quarter of a century old, and the other almost a half century old, and yet here they are without any support except what it is possible now and then to raise by some sporadic and soul-racking campaign. We are entrusted, as we firmly believe, with the destiny of striving to become a Kingdom of Priests, and a Holy People, and this is our condition, with our two rabbinical seminaries. And where? Not in the Ghetto lands of Europe, but here in rich America, where we wallow in materialistic luxury with our town houses, and our country houses, and our limousines and our country clubs, and it leads one to ask: Where is our preeminence? Our young men are not attracted by the Rabbinate; our children boast of their getting no religious instruction at all, and our synagogues, to say the least, are far from full. Let the aeroplane go over our national educational institutions for a moment. Dropsie College owes its existence to the generosity of one man. I doubt if it could get a single dollar of support from the Jews of America, **although with added resources** it can become a great Jewish center of learning. The Jewish Chautauqua Society, not of course important like the seminaries, is now struggling for a few dollars to enable it to exist.

The Jewish Publication Society is thirty-five years old. It not only brought out Mr. Zangwill to the American reading public—Mr. Zangwill would have been Zangwill without the Jewish Publication Society—but the Jewish Publication Society has developed scores of lesser writers, and it has distributed thousands upon thousands of books, and it is the only institution we have which aims to develop Jewish literature in English, and yet the Publication Society is hopelessly in debt; its very printers' bills

remain unpaid; its work is drastically curtailed, and it cannot get the ear, much less the purse, of the American Jew.

Ladies and gentlemen, what does all this mean? It means to my mind that with our great racial zeal and our spiritual indifference, we are quarrelling about the shell and neglecting the kernel. The question to my mind is: What kind of people are we developing? Philanthropic? Yes. No one could ever rightly complain of our philanthropy; but I need scarcely say that, merely because a people is free from tubercular patients and pauperized widows, is in itself no reason for calling that people a great or a worthy people. A people that has enough money to live upon, and has healthy bodies, is not for that reason alone a great or a worthy people. Where is our soul? Whether we live in Palestine or in Uganda—and accepting Mr. Zangwill's correction, British East Africa—or whether we live in New York or Buenos Aires or Warsaw, what shall it profit us if we have no religion or religious faith, if we have no religious education, if we have no literature?

What I am pleading for, ladies and gentlemen, is a sense of perspective and of relative values. Heaven forbid, that I should attempt to discuss Zionism. I have nothing but the kindest feelings toward the peopling of Palestine, and every Jew has such feelings, but, as I understand Mr. Zangwill has said, and it is my humble opinion too, Palestine alone will never solve the real Jewish question. And all the Federations of Jewish Charities in the world will never solve the real Jewish question.

What is the Jewish question? It is not anti-Semitism; it is not anti-Ku-Klux-Klanism. Anti-Semitism is not a Jewish problem at all. Anti-Semitism is a Christian problem, and the only way we can overcome anti-Semitism is by the Jews as a minority people showing the majority what really good people ought to be, and then the majority following the example. We certainly are not going, as so many foolish Jews seem to believe, to overcome anti-Semitism by giving up our faith. You perhaps know the story of one Jew meeting another on the street and Abe saying to Ike, "Did you know that I was converted?" "Is that so?" "Yes, I was converted a couple of years ago." Abe then said,

"Why don't you get converted too?" "Why," said Ike, "Should I get converted?" "Because I would like to have a Christian friend."

Ladies and gentlemen, the real Jewish problem and the only Jewish problem to my mind is how to become better Jews. What we need, to my mind, is a renaissance of our spiritual and our religious life. We can only do that in and through our fundamental institutions of religion and of learning. That renaissance will never come through Congresses, American Congresses or World Congresses, even though they may be addressed by the greatest literary figure among the Jews. On the contrary, I am perhaps cowardly enough to believe that those movements will only be seized upon, unrighteously and unfairly, of course, but seized upon, by the Henry Fords and our other enemies as being evidence of some international union on the part of the Jews to seek purely Jewish advancement without reference to the national advancement of the country in which we live.

What we need, to my mind, is the more fundamental, even if less conspicuous, work of building up our institutions of religion and learning, of filling our synagogues, of putting spiritual leaders in our pulpits, of giving schools to our young people where they may go to learn the glories and traditions of our faith, of developing our literature and spreading the work of an Israel Zangwill among the body of our people, so that they may from his picturization of the beauty and spirituality of Judaism get renewed interest and faith from the religion that has been handed down to us.

In conclusion, and coming more to the spirit of this occasion, I want to say that I hope and pray and firmly believe that long after Congresses shall have passed away, and long after Palestine redeemed or otherwise, as God may will, shall have disappeared as an issue dividing Jews from one another, the matchless literature which Israel Zangwill has given us will survive as a precious heritage of the children of Israel.

ADDRESS BY SIMEON STRUNSKY

When I was first invited to come here tonight to say a few words on the literary side in tribute to Mr. Zangwill, the task obviously was not a very difficult one. There was certainly enough in that shining career to supply more than one introductory speaker. But unfortunately for my peace of mind, during one or two days after I had accepted the invitation, I came across the article in *The Nation* to which you, Mr. Zangwill, referred a little while ago, and while I agree with you that it does pay tribute to the outstanding work you have done in the field of literature, I was all at once struck with horror in coming across one phrase there. The writer regretted, he said, that of recent years the limpid and brilliant stream of creative genius that runs through Zangwill's work has become murky and turgid with propaganda. I was faced with two alternatives. I had to come here and praise the literary man in Mr. Zangwill, and apparently the only thing I could do was to pass over in charitable silence those fifteen or twenty notorious years of yours which have become murky with propaganda, and here on October 28, 1923, to express my warm admiration for the splendid literary productions you have given to the world and to the Jewish race up to, let us say, the year 1908. That did not seem to be a very pleasant sort of thing to do. The other thing was to take the strong hand, to which, by this time, you are fairly accustomed, and to turn upon you rather indignantly, and to say: "What do you mean by diverting your creative genius from the creation of pure beauty, and turning it into the channels of murky propaganda? And what do you mean really, Mr. Zangwill, by taking those splendid powers, and not devoting them to writing things that we would like you to do, and insist, instead, on passionately spending them on things that you want to do?" That bothered me for a while until all at once a redeeming thought did come. As I pondered over this phrase about the limpid and brilliant stream of Zangwill's genius turning turgid, it occurred to me all at once: What is there? There is something I have heard of before, that often sets out to be limpid and brilliant, and turns murky and turgid,

or that sometimes is alternately limpid and murky and brilliant and turgid, and I said, "By Jove, that is my own business, journalism."

And so it occurred to me that here was the way out. I need not exercise any charitable silence over Mr. Zangwill's past; I need not violate my own convictions or rather the convictions of the writer in *The Nation*, but I need very sincerely, as a practicing newspaper man myself, extend greetings to Israel Zangwill, the greatest journalist of the Jewish race engaged in performing what, I suppose, is the great duty of the journalist, and that is to raise a riot. It was all the easier for me to approach Mr. Zangwill from this point of view because—and here I must speak a little bit about myself, not too much—it is on his journalistic side that I first got to know him, and though I have read "The Children of the Ghetto," and I have read and seen some of his plays, and I believe I am well founded in what you would call the Zangwillian literature, my first love, and I still think my lasting love, was a certain series of articles which way back about the year 1894 or 1895 were appearing in the Pall Mall Magazine, under the title "Without Prejudice." I was at that time at High School and I do remember very well that many hours that should have gone into plain and spherical trigonometry went into I. Zangwill. I remember few things of that time as vividly as those brilliant monthly causeries, the wit, the stab, the lift, the little touch of the burlesque, and beneath it all the undertone of thought appearing over the signature of I. Zangwill.

There was another point. I must confess that for a long while I thought that I. Zangwill was a pseudonym. I had not read any of his books, though some of them had appeared before; I made their acquaintance later, but it seemed to me that it was a very adequate pseudonym for the material that appeared above it. Always I felt, as I read it, that it said, "I, Zangwill, know this; and I, Zangwill, think this way; I, Zangwill, point out this folly; I, Zangwill, form this belief and you could take it or leave it." For myself I confess that I took it.

Another confession. I suppose that all young men who dream

of writing some day, have their ideals, and, like Merton of the Movies, I suppose, they sometimes metaphorically go down on their knees at night, and pray to God to make them a good writer. In my time I have prayed to be made in the model of various people, after Robert Louis Stevenson, and after Kipling, I confess, and after—I went as high as Anatole France, I am sorry to say, but the first of the models for which I entreated a Higher Power more or less was I. Zangwill, and perhaps, speaking quite humbly and quite sincerely, as I look back over my work today, I think perhaps that Providence in its mysterious way did answer them, and that perhaps a little bit of that wit, a little bit of that passion for justice, a little bit of that light touch over heavy things, has been vouchsafed me.

I find it, therefore, quite natural to stand here tonight and to greet, I suppose in behalf of all of you, I am sure you agree with me, this great journalist, as I think of him. I do not sympathize with the writer in *The Nation* who reproaches him for abandoning the service of pure beauty for the service of propaganda. I think that Zangwill here has taken his stand with very many great men who have grown tired after a while of creating beauty for particular people, and have decided to get down to the murky grind of life, and to fight and perhaps to adulterate that pure beauty with the dust of reality. I think he stands with his own townsman, Charles Dickens, who, I understand, had some sort of affection for the creation of beauty, but who also knew the beauty of pity and justice. I think he stands with Victor Hugo, who knew something of justice and pity. I think he stands with Tolstoi, and he stands with a man with whom he stands so close in other ways, and that is Heinrich Heine.

What life has done to Israel Zangwill is what it has done to a great many men. It has shown him that the creation of pure beauty in its ultimate result is not the highest desideratum, and there are other ends to be striven for, and at the same time, perhaps, Zangwill has demonstrated that his brilliancy and limpidity have not altogether been weighted down with the sediment of propaganda.

I have listened to you tonight, Mr. Zangwill, and the murki-

ness and the turgidity do not impress me very hard. Thus, while I greet in you tonight the born journalist,—I think that gift was born in you—perhaps it was born in you three or four thousand years ago. You have spoken of the Jews as a race of journalists. I think that is a very happy description. Perhaps the thing began one night there, when the populace of the East Side of the Mediterranean were roused by cries on the sidewalks, and they looked out and saw and they heard the groups of men with long beards and in sandals yowling, as we have often heard, “Extra, Extra, all about the one God, all about the God of Justice.” That outcry, I suppose, in modified form, has kept on through the ages. Where those news-vendors got the story from, I really do not know myself, nor for that matter do I think it is of primary significance. Perhaps, as the common belief is, they got it by special wireless from Mount Sinai; perhaps they picked up a hot tip somewhere in the vicinity of Ur, or they lifted a story right from under the noses of the taxpayers of Tut-Ankh-Amen who had a wretched sense for news, and did not know a story when they saw it.

But obviously, wherever it started, it was Mr. Zangwill’s ancestors who wrote the story and who put it across. They sold Jehovah to the world, although not in the sense which Jehovah frequently complained of. I hope you would not think I am too much of a bore if I harp upon this side of my personal interest, an interest which I am trying to shoulder upon Mr. Zangwill too, but I cannot help thinking what an extraordinary journalistic enterprise that was, that newspaper business, first set up in the Palestinian hills, in Palestine, Mr. Zangwill, and not in Uganda or in Cyreneca. It was at the same time the most radical and the most conservative newspaper business ever promoted. It had a story to tell that was new and startling, almost to the point of being yellow, and yet it never reached out for enormous circulation. It faced with splendid courage the problems as they arose. It was never afraid to hurt the feelings of its readers, but it always aimed to address itself to the people; they called them The Chosen People. They stood up against the oppression of the heavy adversary, the big business, the Syrians, the Babylonians,

and the armies of the Romans, but in quieter times, I am sorry to say, they used to relapse very frequently from the higher standards of journalism, and they used to wander off after the serpent gods and the dogheaded gods and the fish-headed gods and the other comic supplements of the heathen. Well, it all ended pretty sadly. This enterprise had its good times and its bad times; it had its crises and its reorganizations, and it ended up by their losing control of the real estate and the office building in which this newspaper business was being run, and they went out into the world, drab newspaper men, vagabonds, going about everywhere, travelling in one sense in a way that would delight the heart of a managing editor, for they always traveled at their own expense. Well, and that is the way you see it has kept up through the ages. After that special extra about one God and the God of Justice, there was one extra which in a way, of course, surpassed all others in circulation, that extra about the Kingdom of Love, as opposed to the Kingdom of Justice, and then after a leap through the ages, you get an extra "All about the materialistic conception of history" with red headlines by Karl Marx, and you have had extras since then, "Extra, all about the Melting Pot; Extra, all about internationalism; Extra, all about the Balfour Declaration," but always these journalists have carried a message, always they have had a story to tell, and always they have succeeded in raising a riot.

It seems to me, then, Mr. Zangwill, that we are very fairly justified in forgetting the troubles that may beset you in the way of insufficient limpidity and brilliancy, and annex you to the profession which is mine personally, and to the profession which seems to be ours racially. Whatever may have happened to your limpidity or brilliancy, I think you are quite fit for us tonight. Newspaper men, you know, are admitted everywhere, in spite of their manners, in spite of their clothes. Bernard Shaw in the Doctor's Dilemma makes a very telling stroke against the pressmen, when one of the characters says to the reporters "Yes, you are going. Cane?" "No cane." "Gloves?" "Of course no gloves." It was a terrible thing to Bernard Shaw apparently, that newspaper men should carry no canes and wear no gloves.

I do not think you brought any gloves into Carnegie Hall with you, Mr. Zangwill. But somehow or other the opinion Mr. Bernard Shaw wanted to convey about gloves making the gentleman does not strike me. Without gloves, it seems to me, that you still stand out to us as the great journalist, the gentleman, one of the shining stars in Israel.

* * *

MR. ZANGWILL: These remarks are merely to thank the speakers, and to say how lucky it was that they did not speak before me. I do not therefore have to repudiate all these praises. It is such a late hour and so I will not say now that I do not deserve them, because there is really no time. But I am not going to argue with Mr. Marshall any more—not tonight, I mean—but I welcome very much his willingness to join in the proposed round-table conference, and so we are now two, and I hope, like the little nigger boy, we will get more and more and at least ten and a *minyun*.

With regard to Judge Stern's brilliant speech, the idea that I should go up in an aeroplane and review the religious situation, that is exactly what I did in writing to the local Rabbi, but he cut out the points I wished to make, and somebody has been talking to me lately about going up in an aeroplane, and seeing the religious situation, and I said that would cause more ructions than what I said about politics, and I am in for further ructions when I talk to the *goyim* at the Town Hall. So altogether I am in for a fine time, as I said. I am glad my wife will be here to see that the funeral goes off all right.

I am very glad you did ask Mr. Strunsky to continue his brilliant speech; one of the most enjoyable speeches I have ever heard. I feel very much flattered that he had ever thought that he would like to write or talk like me. I think he has talked better than I tonight, but there is only one thing; he still has that fallacy that, just because our journalism of Jehovah and Justice began in Palestine, that it has to stop there. Isn't he carrying it on here in America? Can't it be carried on everywhere, where Jews are, and that would make a Jewish state, and would have the same inspiration. I will never agree that only

in Palestine can you have this inspiration. I remember that during the Boer War, when Kruger had to run away from his state, and leave the capital, and sat at a siding in a railway carriage with his cabinet, he said: "The capital of the Transvaal is wherever the president and cabinet are; this railway train is the capital." Wherever you have the spiritual genius of the Jew, wherever he is fulfilling his mission, that is the Jewish state. Besides which, Mr. Strunsky made a slight geographical error. This journalism did not begin in Palestine; it began in Mesopotamia. Abraham was the first one who cried out for justice, the first journalist of justice was Abraham. But as he spoke so nicely about me and about my desire for ethical justice and so forth, I was reminded of an anecdote I might tell you. I went to a dinner in London given in my honor, and the speaker of the evening, speaking of me, said that I was the expounder in English literature of ethical beauty. I was rather pleased with that, and then some months later, one of my plays was running, and this gentleman wrote to say, he seemed to be the head of a large section of young men's societies, that they all wished to go to this play, and would I make a special rate for them. This special rate was made for them, and they all came to the play, but this lover of ethical justice never settled the bill.

I mean no suspicion to Mr. Strunsky. I always remember that incident when I am praised. One knows that Dr. Johnson said: "When anyone talked of honor at his table, he began to count the spoons."

And now, ladies and gentlemen, it is such a late hour, and we have enjoyed such a feast of reason and a flow of soul and other things—and the feast of reason and the flow of soul is always *kosher* and you do not have to prepare especially for them—it is getting on towards midnight, and I will end with my great gratitude to you for your kindness in listening to my speech on Jewish politics, which I know you do not agree with.

THE CRISIS OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION*

(NOELTING AND SPENGLER)

THE SOCIOLOGICAL PROBLEM OF CIVILIZATION

BY PROF. LUDWIG STEIN

The well known Detmold philosopher, Dr. Erik Nölting, disciple of Franz Oppenheimer, who is to lecture on similar problems shortly at the University of Frankfort, held a series of lectures in Berlin last year on the problem of national culture. Nölting's topics grouped themselves under three headings, terminating in a discussion with Oswald Spengler.

On the first evening he spoke on: "What is the meaning of national '*Kultur*'?"

The second evening his subject was: "What dangers threaten our national '*Kultur*'?"

And his third evening was devoted to a talk on: "How can we preserve and enhance our national '*Kultur*'?"

Before I turn to the essential dispute between Nölting and Spengler, I want to set forth my own attitude, as I formulated it in my work about "The Beginnings of Human Civilization." (Teubner. Leipzig. 1906).

By "nature" we mean, according to Kant, the existence of things as far as it is determined by universal laws. Whatever assumes its original form, without human addition; growing wild, uncontrolled,—all this we include in the general concept: "nature." The idea of "culture," on the other hand, belongs essentially to modern times, even though the word is derived from the Latin. *Cultura* the Romans understood to mean the tilling of the soil. Varro and Quinctilian speak of *cultura* only

* Address as guest of honor, delivered Jan. 27, 1924. Translated from the German, by Miss Ruth Benjamin. Translation approved by Prof. Stein.

when they mean agriculture, tillage, or, in a wider sense, farming in general. Cicero and Horace use the figure of speech in a metaphorical sense: *cultura animi*, culture of the soul. Now while the word "*natura*" derived from the procreative process was setting out on its triumphal journey through three eras and all branches of literature, so that it has passed over into our very flesh and blood,—the stunted shoot called "*cultura*," leaning against the metaphor of soil-cultivation, led a forgotten, soundless existence in the underground vaults of Roman dictionaries, until modern times, with Kant and Herder, assigned it a specially favored place in the sun.

Today the concept of culture stands as a rival of equal rank with that of nature. Absolute regularity in the occurrence of all events, taking place without conscious purpose, therefore without human intervention,—this we call nature. Whatever the human race, on the other hand, gains by working, purposely, consciously,—whatever is planned, striven for and attained—this we call culture. A thing which grows wild out of the ground, without requiring human labor and strength, is a natural product. But a thing which only takes form with the addition of human labor is an artificial or civilized product. The unconsciously purposeful creative activity of nature is corrected by human energy, by means of conscious aim and a perfected system of adapting ends to means. By means of the tools which man, as an imitative being, fashions in gradual imitation of his own organs, and with the help of the institutions and labor saving devices which he invents, man accelerates the monotonous, slow, course of natural events and knows how to make them serviceable to his own purposes. A state of nature is, therefore, one in which man is controlled by his surroundings. A civilized condition, on the other hand, presupposes control of his environment by man.

The relation of nature and culture to each other is somewhat that of the primeval forest to a work of art, or that of an uncut piece of marble to the Apollo Belvedere. In the natural state, every living creature is a slave of its environment, merely a product of sun and climate, of wind and weather, of

woods and waters. Man especially is there only a result of the condition of the soil, altitude, the course of rivers, the shapes of mountains, of flora and of fauna. In the civilized state, human power wins the mastery over the blind forces of nature.

Spengler's book "*Der Untergang des Abendlandes*," is characterized by a philosophy of history stamped with romanticism. In dramatic form Spengler writes a story of the universe, taking as a basis a peculiar interpretation of history. Professor Hans Eibl, of Vienna, has criticized the main concepts of Spengler's philosophy of history in the thirty-sixth volume of my *Archives of the History of Philosophy*. (October, 1924.) In the form of four short theses, Spengler's ideas are briefly summed up:

1. Civilizations are spiritual organisms or higher souls that suddenly appear, complete in all essentials, in the midst of a given district, after a period of preparation; they develop, and then they die. It will be well to take the phrase about the higher soul, not as a poetic figure of speech, but as the proper expression for something real.

2. Civilizations are distinct entities; each has its own individuality; they can learn nothing from each other and can give each other nothing. There is no such thing as storing up the treasures of civilization in the course of history.

3. The life of the "higher souls" has a typical history, in which four ages may be distinguished.

4. The duration of life of each civilization is about a thousand years. To that may be added about five hundred years of preparation.

The civilizations we survey up to the present time are: from 3000 to 1500 B. C., the Egyptian and the Babylonian; from 1500 B. C. up to Christ, the Classic (Greek), the Indian, and the Chinese; from the middle of the first millenium before Christ, or even earlier, to about 1000 A. D., the Arabian or culture of the Magi, and from 500 A. D. up to, and including, the present, the Teutonic. Apart from these civilizations lies the culture of the Mayas in Central and South America, which is preserved only in

ruins; at the time of the discoveries it was already in the late stage of civilization. A new spirit, the Russian, is now rising above the horizon. Submerged in this universal pattern, the picture of Arabic culture may now be woven, together with that culture of the ancient Medes and Persians that is called Magianism. To the period of preparation belong the Judaism of the Old Testament, the religion of Zoroastrianism and the Chaldean religion, which, according to Spengler, is not a reappearance of the long since decadent Babylonian world, but an ushering in of the new soul. The earliest period has two phases, the Prophetic, from 700 to 500 B. C. (the Jewish Prophets and Zoroaster), and the Apocalyptic, about 3000 B. C. At the turn of the era the place of the world allegory and the meaning of the world soul are complete. At the side of the pseudomorphic Christianity worked the Arabic soul of powerful Talmud Judaism and the new Persian religion. The great achievement of the Jewish spirit lies not in the days of the Prophets, preceding Christ, but in the Talmud Judaism of the first five Christian centuries.

The philosophy of history of Erik Nölting is of an entirely different nature. In his analysis of cultural anti-Semitism, which is set forth in his pamphlet, "Disintegrating Judaism" (Berlin, 1923), Nölting has opposed the conservative romanticism of Spengler with his own interpretation of history, which resembles mine. His language is brilliant and striking. Tellingly Nölting differentiates three driving motives in anti-Semitism, namely religious fanaticism, economic competition and biological theories of race. The economic anti-Semitism of Werner Sombart's book, "Jews and Economic Life" (1911), had already been answered by the weighty arguments of Lujo Brentano's "Judaism and Capitalism" (Leipzig, 1923). Nölting adds new material in order to break up this modern legend, and at the close of his exposition, he meets Spengler as well as Sombart with the following words, which may at the same time serve as examples of the style of this powerfully eloquent *Kultur* philosopher:—"Judaism has scarcely toiled a hundred years in freedom's light. Why, it is only now living through the first decades of its European experience as a fellow creature; it was too long the "scapegoat of the Middle

Ages," as Cahn says; it has a thousand years of imprisonment in the Ghetto behind it. So it is really not strange that it has not quite lost the marks of its wounds. The fact that emancipation is still not complete, is still imperfect even today, is shown in the way the Jews today, after centuries of "dishonorable trade with trash and coupons," are still driven into occupations and positions which they would never have chosen were they really free; and in these occupations they still react according to their fixed resentment. Such a condition is easily mistaken for disintegration. Of course, it is understood that such symptoms of disintegration are not the rudiments of a return to ferocious savage instincts, but merely an instinctive impulse forwards on the path of human development and human equality.

The three lectures on national culture are filled and animated by the same spirit of true humanity, showing the influence of Herder. In contrast to Oswald Spengler's aesthetic picture of history, Nölting finds the universal rhythm, with Nietzsche, in the "oneness of custom in the life of a people," or, better still, in Simmel's definition of culture as "the path of the soul to itself." What the romanticist Spengler calls the "soul of a culture," the German Romanticists and Lazarus and Steinthal called "*Volksgeist*." Nölting rightly holds against Spengler the fact that his playing with analogies is nothing but a juggling with ideas. A death-hour of a civilization can only be talked about at the end of the assimilation process. Nölting might have added that according to the maxim of Clausius, "the entropy of the world leads to a maximum striving," or, according to Herbert Spencer, the evolution of the universe flows toward a universal equilibrium, which includes, not only the decline of the West, but the decline of the universe. I go a step farther in opposition to Spengler than Nölting does. To me Spengler's "*Untergang des Abendlandes*" is a historical novel with scientific trimmings, something like the "Egyptian Princess" of George Ebers, who was chiefly an Egyptologist, and, only incidentally, a novelist. Spengler's chief position is that of novelist, and his sub-office is that of one who knows everything, and, what is more, one who knows better than everyone else. In the Winter of 1923-1924, I lectured

at the most important American universities and discussed Spengler's historical philosophy in a critical way. This winter my American lectures appeared in English, under the title, "Evolution and Optimism" (New York, Sept., 1926). The sociological optimism, which I have held since my lectures at the university and at the Polytechnic School in Zurich, in 1887, on the subject of "The Social Question in the Light of Philosophy," which have appeared as lectures on Sociology and its History, published by Ferdinand Enke (4th edition, Stuttgart, 1923),—this optimism is opposed to the basic conception of Spengler, from the first line to the last. In the preface to the fourth edition I say: "Oswald Spengler's *"Untergang des Abendlandes"* stands in complete opposition to the method and purpose of my book. Spengler's picture of history rests on emotionally colored judgments. His road points downward, mine upward." The concluding words of the new edition of this book (page 578) are likewise directed against Spengler: "And so we stand, having reached the conclusion of our exposition, facing unsolved question marks. We wander about a good deal, without direction, in order to escape the confusion of the post-war period and its convulsive revolutionary quivers. We hold fast, heedless of all relapses and regressions, to our calm fundamental conviction that the line of development leads upward. The West is *not* declining! The Western European-American system of civilization will outlive this crisis. Even in sociological matters there is such a thing as a self-cure. Our powers are healthy, our life-blood is sound. We shall escape from the present hell and find a way to freedom. We say with Kant: 'The starry heaven above me; the moral law within me.'"

It will be understood, after this declaration of my attitude, that I feel a kinship with the rhetorically perfect accomplishment of Nölting, especially in his second lecture, "What dangers threaten our social culture?" Professor Nölting discussed the question as to whether we really face the end of the world, or whether there is still a possibility of curing the abnormal conditions that exist. He examined the critical symptoms that are actually present in our generation, and that show themselves in the profound uncertainty that exists in the foundations of our civilization. The

longing for the mystic religious, which shows itself in this yearning for Asia, in the reception of the Russian Bolshevik problem, even more in the poetic-religious realm than in the political-social aspects, the return to the romance and mysticism of the middle ages—all these, and in fact all other reform movements show the lack of unity, the torn condition of national culture. The revolt of youth, the colonization movement, the emancipation of woman were called by Nölting protests against the lies of drawing-room culture. They are attempts of the soul to flee from the rank growth of material things. In considering all these movements as symptoms of a crisis, all scholars, according to Nölting, are agreed, no matter how much they may differ on other matters. But their unanimity is at once disturbed if we pass from analysis to the question: Is this whole development unchangeable, or can it be prevented? The answer to this question depends on one's conception of civilization. If one breaks with Spengler's conception that a civilization is an organic being, with a limited term of life, whose birth and blooming must be followed by a frost, and thinks of civilization as the outcome of historical-political fate, (as set forth in the first lecture),—then, of course, one must recognize the danger of these symptoms; but the road remains clear; it is not certain that we are headed for destruction. It is also not certain that we shall get well, but at least there is a possibility, inherent in the principle. For if the diseased appearance of our civilization does not depend on an inherent development, but is called forth by external influences, it may be cured under certain conditions.

In spite of all these proofs, so Nölting continued, it is still claimed that the situation of German civilization is particularly hard because it is not unified, but contains foreign origins and foreign elements. This refers less to the Western elements that have penetrated from France and England than to the noxious thing that is discerned in Judaism's strong alien influence on national culture. Professor Nölting sketched with broad strokes the reproaches that so-called Kultur anti-Semitism raises up against Jews and refuted them by means of historical reflections. He established the fact that the Hebrews, as long as they lived as

a national state in Palestine, exhibited the typical culture of a people that lived mainly on agriculture,—not better and not worse than all other races of the same grade of civilization. They were free of all financial and capitalistic motives, for, so he said, there is no religion more hampering to capitalism than the Hebrew faith. The real traits of the Jews have been effaced by the unheard of afflictions that they suffered in exile and still suffer. Nevertheless it must be said that the Jews in Germany have produced culture values that are far in excess of the proportion to which their numbers obligate them. Professor Nölting came to the conclusion that it is not Judaism that menaces German civilization, but the fact that the German people is again concerned with unnecessary and false problems at a time when decisive cultural achievements are expected of it. The German nation is always busy with inopportune problems, as Nietzsche said long ago.

In the last lecture of the series, Professor Erik Nölting started from the fact that we have today much empty and unprofitable fanaticism on the subject of *Kultur*. It would be worth while to find the right way to get out of it. As the middle point of his remarks he laid down the fundamental axiom that in considering all social and political conditions that are recognizable, such as capitalism, materialism, democracy, etc., we are concerned with the results of historical development which must be looked upon as occurrences and cannot simply be extinguished. We cannot go back beyond the eighteenth century, as many of us today are trying to do, as though we were Don Quixotes. Nölting described how our present civilization grew out of the blending of Humanism and the Renaissance, and how the world-image was transformed from the religious-ethical to the scientific-aesthetic ideal of modern times; he told how the true and the beautiful triumphed over the holy and the good; the seeker, over the wise man; the political human being, over the religious zealot. These spiritually changed foundations correspond to the logical course of the social and political results. Out of the same process arise on the one hand the leveling of the soul, on the other the new joy of living, as it has continued from Ulrich von Hutten's shout of joy into our own century. And so each development is followed by its

opposite on the other side; thus the bourgeois—industrial world has its shadow, the socialistic-proletarian-anti-capitalistic world. Whoever, even approximately, feels the compelling force in the current of this development, knows that the issue must be as it is and not otherwise, knows that it is impossible to alter even a small part; for development cannot be traced to foreign importation, to Western influence or to the adoption of Jewish habits, but only to time. Nölting turned sharply against the misuse that is being made today of the word decomposition. Everyone who tries to give the present time its due, and does not wish to join in historical necromancy, (Siegfried, Wotan, Baldur, etc.), is blamed today for the “decomposition” of civilization. All this is only a false alarm, which draws attention away from the really dangerous places; and whatever opinion one may have of Spengler’s work, he has a great service to his credit, because he has awakened people from their old humdrum ways!

In brilliant passages of thought and figurative language, Nölting next pointed out the dangers which always arise in a civilization at the moment when it is only the private concern of a narrow circle,—gentlemen’s culture,—and no longer the spiritual heritage of the whole people. That was the moment at which Greece fell, and which we have reached today. Every restoration period has falsified acoustics. The cry from the depths of the social order must not die away unheard; it must be listened to, if our civilization is not to perish. The social situation is rendered more acute by the fact that the consolidation of religion is no longer at hand. A mere gesture of pity cannot accomplish anything today. Only a profound social revolution can help our civilization to get beyond the lifeless period which it has now reached. Far-reaching legal and property guarantees to the working class, which will free it from the burden of its pariah-like existence; social widening of our culture and reanimation of the great religious fundamental ideas,—all these are necessary to save our civilization and to help us out of the social milieu, in which the most righteous is involved in the sin of his fellow-men. Even then there will still be trouble enough in the world, but only tempering, not ravaging suffering. Thus Professor Nölting closed his weighty ex-

position: We may, perhaps, lose something of external, aesthetic beauty in the process. "But the important fact remains that an age of social justice is dawning, in which we shall all have good consciences, which all of us Europeans lack today."

I shall now set down my own cultural perspective side by side with these statements of Nölting, with whom I am conscious of affinity in every word:

"As the natural human being is led by instincts, civilized man, according to my comprehension, is led by ideas. First, human beings condense their unconscious race experiences into instincts, their conscious ones into ideas, and afterwards they allow these experiences of past generations to prescribe for them how they shall act, what they shall believe, and even how they shall think. The state takes the developed, civilized man, who, as a citizen, inherits his institutions, just as he is born into a fixed, logical scheme with his psychologically prepared central nervous system,—and prescribes for him how he shall act, how logic shall dictate to him, how he shall think. Civilized people give themselves their own conceptions. The individual changes, the whole remains; the individual dies, the state lives; each member of the state organism may wear away, the state constantly assimilates new members. And, though half civilized people may have created the state in the first place, it is the state, on the contrary, which in the case of fully civilized nations, makes over the man. As the laws of nature regulate atoms or corpuscles, the laws of logic, our sensations, so fundamental laws and constitutions regulate the citizen. Order is exchanged for lawlessness; law takes the place of will. For the natural man the world exists as a disorganized experience, a tangled skein, a chaotic heap. For the civilized man, who has created the highest abstract conceptions for himself and who allows himself to be led by these generalizations, the world is an orderly experience and not blind confusion or the pleasing dream of a sleeping god. It is a *cosmos* working according to the uninterrupted laws of nature, and showing itself in historical fitness as a planned entirety. And all this our ancestors, who stored up this heritage of culture for us in order to leave it to us in our easily and quickly functioning central nervous system,—gained by

painfully working for it. All civilization is a system of saving, by means of unity of interpretation, organization of strength through abstraction, and the regulation of labor according to the law of the smallest amount of energy.

God is the logical premise of the universe. Without the oneness of God, there can be no oneness of self, which allows us to learn to know the *cosmos* as a projected duplication in ourselves of the unity of the universe, where our idol-worshipping ancestors saw only chaos. Man duplicates himself necessarily and irresistibly; he duplicates himself in his highest generalizations, as in his ideas of the universe, and, therefore, in his conception of God. And so we can understand that, and why the spirit of man becomes the law-giver of nature, or, as Kant expresses himself, the laws of nature are, in the final analysis, human laws of thought. Man builds up with his mind the constitution of the universe, and therefore he must conceive of the ruler of the world as a unity, because he sees that he is logically compelled to carry over the ideas of oneness of self, which makes for order in his head, to the idea of God's oneness, which brings order to the whole universe. The endless superiority in human education by means of such unifying religious services as the Mosaic law commands, is founded on the fact that the guidance of the human race becomes unified through this self-created ideal of unity. This has an immense bearing on the education of human volition. The idea of God leads man's capacity for abstract ideas to its highest, unsurpassable and therefore final expression. All races press on toward a system of logic, but all of the more mature civilizations with purer insight always run up against a last principle of unity, whether they call it God, matter or nature. This is not an occurrence which is a matter of choice, which one might have eliminated at will. It is rather an unavoidable compulsion of thought, which reveals itself because of the identically organized intelligence with its identical experience in history, so that circles of thought cannot escape from it for long. The impulse toward unity in each man pushes unceasingly forward toward absolute centralization of the world-principle, or God. God not only *can* be conceived, he *must* be, because we must needs draw the pyramid of laws and

purposes in the world up to one highest point of unity or a top-most principle of order, called God. Monotheism is not only the most profound of historical religions, but also the last word in logic. The necessity for God's existence finds its irrefutable certainty, its logical security in the necessity for thinking of Him. For only that which all of us together inevitably think,—not as individuals, but as members of the human race,—becomes for us the ultimate truth. To be, means: to be imagined inevitable. With our senses we are made aware of the changing external world, with the intellect, (not with feeling and willing), we grasp the laws of nature, with our intuition the variable first principle of the universe: God. To profess God therefore means, (looked at in the light of theoretical knowledge), nothing else but to recognize eternal truths, to understand the mathematics of nature, to respect the laws of logic. In this spirit we may eliminate Spengler's theory of the four stages, and complete and widen Nölting's philosophy of civilization.

As a matter of fact, the leading religious conceptions of the world from the beginning of attested history have run parallel to metaphysical ideas of the world of similar feeling, or mood. Two main religious types of thought have governed the great culture systems of historical peoples: religious pessimism and religious optimism. Not one after the other, as Spengler thinks, but next to each other; not discontinuous, but continuous. Two primeval myths face each other irreconcilably. The watchword of the one is "It was"; that of the other, "It will be". The ancient religious myth of Brahmanism lives on the pluperfect tense; the ancient religious myth of the Parsees lives on the tense of the far distant future. In the religious pessimism of Buddhism, the ideal of perfection, undivided unity, the blessed peace of non-existence, *Nirvana*, stood at the beginning of the world process. This original perfection was lost. Whether through the fall of man, through sin and atonement (Anaximander), through movement and impulse (*conatus*, impetus), through opposition (Fichte,) or contradiction (Hegel), is more a question of myth and allegory than of the essential principle. All religious pessimists agree with Spengler that the world journey of the universe is going down-

ward (as with Heraclitus), that we are in the midst of a process of dissolution and decomposition. Their religious hypothesis asserts that the cosmos is declining. For we are sitting on the descending branch. The ideal of perfection, the innocence of Eden, the essence of perfectability are gone, never to be brought back. The world is accordingly a steady decline from the pure original element of fire, or fine ether, to coarse earth (Heraclitus), from the world of existence to the world of appearance, (Parmenides), from external ideas to their pale copies, (Plato), from the pure thought of divinity to the fleeting processes of nature, (Aristotle), from the highest perfection, or God, to its coarser layers in natural occurrences (Neo-Platonists. "The Decline of the West," Spengler). The mythological parallel to this metaphysical pessimism is the world-wide legend of the "Golden Age", which was followed by silver and copper ones. The decline from primeval perfection to steadily increasing imperfection is here expressed on the scale of economic, metallic values. This conception corresponds on the religious side to the teaching of the fall of man, and on the sociological side to the Cynic-Stoic cry of distress, which Rousseau called with flaming tongue into the eighteenth century: Let us return to nature. Finally, and especially, Spengler's historical pessimism. To conceive of civilization as a descent, fall, sign of decomposition in nature, that is nothing else than a special case of the church's lesson of the fall of man, namely the sociological fall of man.

This pessimistic valuation of the world and life, which reaches its most convincing expression religiously in Buddhism, philosophically in Neo-Platonism, and historically in the philosophy of Spengler, has been opposed from time immemorial by the Iranian-Parsee light religion of the Jews. The latter projects the ideal of perfection, not backward into the distant past, but forward into the far off future. The world is not a descent from perfection to imperfection, but, on the contrary, an ascent from imperfection to perfection. The path of the universe does not lead downward, but upward, and the human race in particular develops, not down, from angel to devil, but up, from anthropoids and cannibals to civilization and culture. We are not fallen angels, but risen liv-

ing creatures. Nature and history are not degenerative processes, but an ascending ladder of perfectability—a pyramid of high purposes and of values that are being worked out. The religious imagination of the religions of light is not directed backward, but forward. They do not revel in depicting what is past, lost forever, (Nirvana, Paradise), but only delight in the promise of the future, in the apocalyptic glorification of the perfection of the “end of days” (Eschatology). The Prophets, Bacchic and Orphic visions, the Sibylline Books and the visions of the millenium announce to us with an echo of a hundred voices the “Kingdom of a thousand years”, the coming era of happiness. The Prophets foretell the future consummation of humanity in their own words: Full is the earth of knowledge, as the water covers the sea. The Millennarians prophesy the dawning of the kingdom of a thousand years. The philosophers of the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century set forth the doctrine of the three stages, (in the case of Fichte, in the “Characteristics of the Present Age”, five phases), in which the rise of history from bestiality to humanity is accomplished. Spengler’s theory of steps has important prototypes among the romanticists of the philosophy of history. Nietzsche makes Zoroaster known to us, the prophet of the religion of light, the coming superman, the eternal thought of recurrence, rebirth,—that is the heart of Zoroastrianism, the highest form of affirmation which can never quite be attained. In his interpretation of history, Nölting comes nearer to Nietzsche the further he gets away from Spengler. Today we search with Grillparzer for the “golden fleece”, with Ibsen for the “third kingdom”, with Tolstoy for “God’s Kingdom on Earth”, with Comte for the final state of pure unselfishness, and, finally, with Herbert Spencer for the “ideal social State”. And the same idea is expressed physically in the phrase of Clausius: the entrophy of the world strives toward a maximum. According to his theory the condition of equilibrium toward which, according to Spencer too, the universe is evolving, has not gone, never to return, as the Nirvana doctrine or the theory of the fall of man will have it; but the transformation of heat into kinetic energy leads at last to perfect equilibrium, i. e., cessation of the cosmic processes. Here

we have arrived at the farthest bounds of human knowledge. Whether the world is aging or steadily growing younger, whether our planet is going toward final congelation or gasification, or whether an eternal rotation, "the return of everything to sameness", will take place, as the ancient myth says, whether the human race has a destiny to fulfill, a problem to solve (and which one?)—all these things we shall never, and can never, know with mathematical precision, but we can only believe in them. Where science declares her powerlessness, there faith must let us feel her power. Beyond the bounds of knowledge, the religious hypothesis sets in.

Belief, i. e., the religious hypothesis, is not only older than science, which it gave birth to, but more efficacious educationally, more impressive, more far-reaching than science. Not without reason have countless thinkers, from Augustine to Lessing, seen in religion the lofty "Educator of the Human Race". For what must we thank the historic religions and their mythological forerunners? For everything! They subdued, civilized and domesticated the "*bete humaine*". The difference among historic creeds are matters of time and place, of local color and varying hues of tradition. Creeds are, in our eyes, almost just dialects of a world language, of a religion that embraces all confessions.

This world religion, which is the basis of all creeds, is divided into two systems of education, a pessimistic and an optimistic method. Spengler's conservative romanticism approaches the first type, Nölting and I the second. Both aim at the purification, refining, salvation, and moral education of the genus man. Nirvana religions and prophetic religions pursue the same goal; the moral perfecting of the human race. Only the retrogressing religious forms, the romanticists among the historical and religious philosophers, follow the recommendations of the lesson of the fall of man, and the educational method of lost Paradise. They do this in order to make people more docile, more pliant, more resigned to the destiny of the universe as well as to their own personal fate, fixing the course of world events in descending development from eternity to eternity. The will of each individual is thereby broken and lamed, so that the will of the universe, or divinity, becomes for him imperial, compelling him downward.

This occurs as much in the teachings of Buddha as in the theory of the Greeks, in the fate that the Romans believed in, in the predestination to sin of the church of the Middle Ages, in the Kismet of the Mohammedans, in the inflexible Providence of Calvin's teaching, as well as in the logical fate of Spinoza, and in the materialistic philosophy of Holbach's *Système de la nature*," in the milieu-theory of Taine, in the strongly determined unfolding of the universal will with Schopenhauer, and the "Decline of the West" of Spengler.

Since the time of Zoroaster these pessimistic types of religion have been opposed in principle by the messianic-optimistic religions and the dynamic-organic philosophy systems. To them the world picture presents itself in such a fashion that the actual present is not governed by the past, but by the future. Their familiar metaphor, the picture they look at, is not the dead atom, but life itself, nay the living cell. It is not a mechanism, whose parts precede the whole, but a living organism, within whose embryonic cells each part is foreshadowed, laid out according to plan, and predisposed, so that the whole goes first in the plan, and the parts, including the individual members of the body, and the color of the skin, hair and eyes, the temperament and character, grow into the plan later on, which was already completely indicated in the egg cell. The whole is recognized intuitively, and parts discursively. With an organism, each process, such as growth, digestion, absorption, assimilation, reproduction, takes place, not going backwards, but forwards, with regard to the future, to the purpose which the parts must fulfill in the design of the whole, into which the parts grow afterwards, according to biological laws.

Which religious hypothesis, then, brings about the more educational, more useful, results, and which makes people happier, the pessimistic or the optimistic interpretation of the universe? Spengler or Nölting? That man models himself in his gods, has been a platitude since the time of Henophanes. And so there is scarcely a difference of opinion among earnest thinkers as to the fact that we are on the way to inevitable anthropomorphism, that by feeling as one, introjecting, or inlaying, we carry over our own qualities to the All-One. We project our microcosm out into the

macrocosm. The only question is: which part of our existence shall we project in duplicate, our muscular system or our nervous system? Our coarse skeleton or our fine central nervous system? Our body or our soul? Our mechanism and chemistry or our mental functions? The materialists say: the body, which develops according to mechanical laws; the dualists demand both; body and soul; the idealists say: the spirit, which acts according to teleological, causative, laws, i. e., according to aim and means.

The universe is not a despotic monarchy, whose orders are handed down from above, but a democratic republic, whose orders come up from below. In the laws or categories of nature, that part of the fundamental law is laid down that is absolutely essential to the union and coherence of the *cosmos* ("Mathematics of Nature"); but in history that purposeful rhythm is revealed, that tendency, toward which man strives in his building up of ideals. Nature runs its course according to first causes, history according to motives.

Therefore, every optimistically directed religion—Judaism is that, *par excellence*—shares in the basic suppositions of organic-aesthetic Pantheism, willingly or unwillingly. In the universal process, not only cold law or hard justice are dispensed, but also beauty and goodness, as Socrates carried over the Hellenic ideal of *Kalokagathie* into the world of the gods, and in Plato's philosophy the highest idea of God corresponded with the idea of goodness. The Messianic religions of light completely remove the life to come, Paradise, occupying a certain space, into the temporal, "end of days", into the "third Kingdom", into a "The day will come". And entirely parallel is the evolution idea of Herbert Spencer which claims that there is a steady upward development of the universe until the perfect equilibrium is achieved or until the entropy of the world reaches its maximum. (Clausius.)

Which belief makes one more blessed, happier, more enterprising? The belief in a "lost Paradise" or in "God's Kingdom on Earth"? Buddhism or belief in a Messiah? Spengler or Nöltling? The longing, elegiac looking-backward of the Romanticists with their enervating "It used to be", or the brave, upright

Hosanna of the progressive religions with their messianic, psalm-singing "It is going to be" and the admonition of the psalmist, "Serve ye the Lord in joy"?

Which educational system has proved itself better before the forum of a sociology of history: the pessimistic or the optimistic religious hypothesis? Mohammedan fatalism or the Kantian doctrine of freedom? The Buddhist-Indian Nirvana teaching, which has a depressing and enervating effect, or the European-American doctrine of energy, which conceives of the universe as power, energy, labor, action? According to the latter, God is the monad of monads, the world force in the largest sense, just as we human beings represent this world dynamics on a small scale. Each monad—to speak according to Leibnitz—is pregnant with the future (*gros de l'avenir*). Each man carries his own world formula, his life melody, within himself; that is his spiritual backbone, his moral support, his ethical conscience, his religious ideal. The world is not given to us, but set as a task, says Fichte; it is not the kingdom of existence but of obligation, of the lesson to be mastered, of the duty to be fulfilled. Men or races without ideals, without tasks, without a life goal and a life purpose, without a life plan and a life tendency, are as atoms whirling around in space would be, if gravitation did not show them the direction to take. Ideas and ideals are the laws of gravitation in the realm of history. We can only strive toward these ideals, not reach them; only believe in them, but never carry them out completely. But while we believe in them, we are about to make them come true, step by step. For the salvation of the human race does not lie behind us, but before us. Those are the lessons of a sociology which "promises us a new heaven and a new earth". The wrong ways of Bolshevism and the zigzag twistings of revolution do not lead us astray from the final aims of a sociology of history, as taught by our "social optimism", which turns toward the Prophets for guidance. We believe with II Isaiah in universalism, humanism and pacifism. We will not allow the optimism which we have kept and tried through three thousand consecutive years of history to be taken from us, or even lessened, by the false prophets of retrogression.

RACE THEORY AND ANTI-SEMITISM*

By PROF. JULIUS GOLDSTEIN

RACE Anti-Semitism is the latest development in the evolution of Anti-Semitism. It took root in Germany even before the war, because it supports certain political tendencies in that country, but has become virulent since the war, due to the misfortune, hunger and general collapse that have afflicted Germany and that put the country in a mood of looking for a scapegoat, which is naturally found in the Jew. The race theory did not originate in Germany, but was started rather by two Frenchmen, Count De Gobineau and Renan. The chief protagonist of the movement, however, is an Englishman by the name of Houston Chamberlain, who settled in Germany and who wrote a book, "The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century." This book has become the bible of race anti-Semitism and is the most disastrous book in centuries as regards animosities toward the Jew. It is responsible for a very extensive literature against the Jews. Race anti-Semitism makes "nation" equivalent to "race." The Jews belong to another race than the Germans. Therefore they cannot belong to the German "Nation." Therefore the Jews are aliens. The only creative race in the world is the Teutonic or the Nordic; all other races are inferior, especially the Semitic. All the faults of the Jew are due to his race. They cannot be corrected by education, for they are in the blood. Those who gave emancipation to the Jews at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century believed that the faults of the Jews were due to oppression and the Ghetto, and under conditions of fair play and opportunity would disappear. This was a mistake. It is not wise to give equal rights to the Semites, for by virtue of their unalterable race inferiority they will only abuse them. Therefore these rights must be annulled. The speaker then entered upon his own views as opposed to this race theory.

* Summary of Address Delivered March 2, 1924.

He argued that it is not true that "nation" is synonymous with "race." Every European nation is built up of many races. On the contrary, the nation represents a victory of spirit over blood, for it is made possible only by the overcoming of racial hostilities. Not even the Jewish race is pure, but is perhaps the most mixed in the world. Then, too, if only one race is creative, how are we to recognize its superiority? We must have some anthropological gauge. The race theorists claim that the Nordic race is distinguished by its blond hair, blue eyes, tall stature, and a longheaded skull. The speaker then showed that such men as Rafael, Napoleon, Kant, Bismarck, Schopenhauer, Goethe, Beethoven, possessed opposite or contradictory physical elements to those required by the race theorists.

It is argued that political radicalism is a race attribute of the Jews, and that, therefore, the Jews everywhere are responsible for revolutionary and destructive elements in society. The speaker conceded that socialism was founded in Germany by Jews, Karl Marx and Ferdinand Lasalle, but, then, all of the German parties, with the exception of the Catholic, were created by Jews, as the speaker went on to prove. It is also assumed as certain, especially by such men as Sombart, that the Jews are merchants by race. This is flatly contradicted by the Bible, according to which the Jews were originally tillers of the soil. The Jewish religion in its spirit and origin is not urban, but rural.

The speaker closed by discussing the race theory from its ethical side. He said that if a man is a product of race, if all crimes and defects are due to blood, if there can be no improvement of the individual owing to his racial inheritance, then man is for the most part an automaton, and the only philosophy that can explain him is fatalism. The bull-dog can be explained in this way. Man has dignity, free will, individuality, perfectibility. We Jews have always opposed race theory, not merely because of its effect on ourselves, but because we are the bearers of the ideal, that man is a soul that may grow more and more perfect under the hallowing inspiration of God.

IMMIGRATION AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION*

BY MAX J. KOHLER

WE hear much nowadays about reading, or not reading, of Bible selections in the public schools, but a more serious inquiry is whether general reading of the Declaration of Independence there, and at other gatherings, has not been practically abolished. We are getting so far away from its opening declaration, that "all men are created equal", that it would seem as if such fundamental principle in our national history has become obsolete. In 1860, at the National Convention of the Republican party at which Abraham Lincoln was nominated for the presidency, the suggestion that this very passage be embodied in the party platform, in a campaign to recognize the rights even of the black man, was at first voted down, but George William Curtis, to whom that principle was sacred, offered the clause anew, daring—as his biographer tells us—

"the representatives of the party of freedom to reject the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, affirming the equality and defining the rights of men",

and the amendment was adopted with a shout of enthusiasm. The Civil War was fought on this issue, and at its culmination, our Constitution was amended so as to prohibit denial to any person within our jurisdiction of the "*equal* protection of the law", and even forbidding abridgment of the right to vote "*on account of race, color* or previous condition of servitude", and equal "Civil Rights Laws" were enacted, State and Federal. We need a new Curtis or a new Theodore Roosevelt, to cry a halt upon the extraordinary racial discrimination underlying the Immigration Law

*Address delivered before the *Judaeans* March 2, 1924, as revised in Dec. 1925.

passed by Congress on May 26th, 1924. The name of Roosevelt is invoked in this connection, because—with particular reference to our immigration policy, he said, as late as 1906 in a famous Presidential message:

"We must treat with justice and good-will, all immigrants who come here under the law. Whether they are Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Gentile; whether they come from England or Germany, Russia, Japan or Italy, matters nothing. All we have a right to question is the man's conduct. If he is honest and upright in his dealings with his neighbor and with the State, then he is entitled to respect and good treatment."

Instead of following such salutary principles, the Immigration Law of last year is based on a most extraordinary theory of relative race valuation and discrimination, making immigrants admissible merely in national categories, welcoming certain nationalities without limit, and practically excluding many others, and establishing national quotas, large or small as the case may be, for the majority. This system is not limited to a year or brief series of years, as the prior quota laws were, beginning in 1921, but is made permanent legislation.

I do not want to spend much time on detailing the complicated provisions of that law. It is well known that it establishes for Europe, and certain other sections of the globe, annual 2% quotas, based not even on the Census of 1910, as was the earlier Quota Act of 1921, but on the Census of 1890. The avowed purpose was to go back to a time *antedating* the large immigration of the so-called "new Immigrants" from Southern and Eastern Europe, primarily the Italians and Greeks, Russians, Poles, Roumanians, Austro-Hungarians and Jews, and calculate the 2% of admissibles upon a census of foreign-born residents, in which those coming from Northern and Western Europe figured relatively much more largely than they did in later censuses, and do today. Not even wives and minor children of resident aliens not yet naturalized are taken out of quotas under this law, with the result that, unless Congress heeds Pres. Coolidge's repeated injunctions, for many years to come, hundreds of thousands of wives and children of

recent immigrants, will be prevented from joining husband and father here. For purposes of comparison, it is best to compare the new quotas thus established with arrivals for the year ending June 30, 1914, the last year before the Great War, which has complicated immigration, as well as so many other things since then. In that year, there were 1,218,480 immigrant aliens, who came over here, nearly all from Europe. The new quota law cut this figure down to a total maximum of 164,000, to about 13%. While Great Britain is given a quota of 34,000 (or over 75% of arrivals of 1914), Germany of 51,000 (over 65% of arrivals of 1914), Ireland of 28,500 (over 84% of 1914 arrivals), yet Italy, for instance, is accorded a maximum of only 3845 (or about 13-10% of the 296,000 who came over in 1914), Greece is given a quota of 100 (compared to 45,800 of 1914), Poland is given a quota of 5982 (compared to 122,600 of 1914), Russia of 2248 (compared to 81,700 of 1914), and Rumania of 603 (compared to 24,070 of 1914). The maximum number of Jews thus admissible is difficult to determine, as the quotas are based upon *nationality* by birth, and not *race*, and the great majority come over as a portion of the quotas of Poland, Russia, Roumania and the former Austro-Hungarian states, but for the first year of the operation of the new Act, 10,292 Jews were admitted, indicating a maximum of about 10,000 per year, as compared with 138,051 Hebrew arrivals of 1914; or about 7¼%. Instead of constituting about 11% of the total number of immigrants and non-immigrant alien arrivals as per the admissions of 1914, the number is now reduced to less than 3%. Even the preference that ought to be accorded to victims of persecution and to immediate members of a family seeking to rejoin each other again, particularly affecting Jewish immigrants, is wholly ignored. Poor Armenia—which suffered almost unparalleled atrocities during the past decade from religious and political persecution—is given a maximum quota of only 124, though even our laws recognized until now, the obligation civilization, and particularly the land of asylum for Puritan, Pilgrim, Huguenot and Quaker, owes to fugitives from religious persecution.

After July 1st, 1927 a new set of quotas are required to be

established, fixing a maximum of 150,000 per year for all immigrant aliens, based on pseudo-scientific guess-work as to the supposed present relative racial race-stock of our country, beginning with an arbitrary speculation as to its constitution in 1790. The 1790 analysis is itself based on mere guess-work as to racial identity, judged by mere names, with every name omitted that did not occur at least 100 times. But in principle this is less offensive and insulting than the present quota figures are.

On the other hand, natives of the American countries north and south of us, are admissible without regard to any quota, with the result that an absolute majority of all immigrants admitted since the new law became effective, were Canadians and Mexicans. As regards persons not capable racially of being naturalized, Asiatics, roughly speaking, they are made wholly inadmissible, except ministers and professors and their wives and minor children, students, and merchants, it being denied by the Government even before our Supreme Court the other day, that there is any right for a resident Chinese or Japanese merchant to have his wife and minor children join him here at any time, and even that Court was constrained to hold, in view of the unambiguous legislation, that one of that race who is a U. S. citizen by birth, may not have his foreign-born wife join him here. On the other hand, Africans and persons of African descent are in terms admissible. Such is, in outline, this extraordinary scheme of national and racial preferences, and attention has repeatedly been directed, even in Congress,—and of course, still more, privately—to the fact that the overwhelming majority of persons now excluded, of those that seek to enter, are Catholics and Jews. Though the act, of course, says nothing about any preference on religious lines, and cannot constitutionally—it is obvious that, intentionally or not, the very persons discriminated against by this quota system, based on a census of 35 years ago—are the two creeds whom the Ku Klux Klan attack as “undesirable”, even with pistol, knife and whip.

It is thus obvious that immigrants—despite Theodore Roosevelt’s reformulation of the American principle in 1906—are subjected to nationality tests, which we heretofore consistently de-

precated as un-American, and not a subject of governmental concern at all. Moreover, instead of applying equal tests to various nationalities, if nationality tests we must have—it is apparent that certain nationalities are strongly preferred, while others are strongly discriminated against. The alleged theory of the discrimination—or at least a factor in it—is supposed greater assimilative capacity and supposed superior value to us, of immigrants from Northern and Western Europe, the so-called “Nordics”, as compared with those coming from the Southern and Eastern sections of the same continent. The facts as to such greater assimilability are in dispute, and in truth we never had such potent and effective agencies for Americanization and assimilation in all our history as today, as our Jewish organizations’ admirable and pioneer Americanization work in particular indicates. But supposed greater assimilation is a proper subject-matter for consideration in connection with naturalization, and has already been taken into account there by our prior laws.

The only really comprehensive study of American naturalization in terms of race-stock that we have, was made by John P. Gavit in his work “Americans by Choice”, issued in 1922 in the “Americanization Studies” series provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. It shows, strangely enough, that the immigrants coming over here between the ages of 1 to 14 wait on the average until 6.2 years after attaining their majority before getting naturalized. Those coming over here between 15 and 20, wait on an average till 11 years after reaching 21, while those coming over after 21 wait, on an average, till $10\frac{1}{2}$ years after reaching majority. Of men naturalized, those waiting the briefest time after becoming qualified, are not the English, Germans, French and Canadians, but the Turks, Greeks, Irish, Russians, Roumanians and Hungarians greatly exceed them in such avidity, as do even the Italians. The explanation is that those coming from countries where there is autocratic government, or political discontent, or inferior economic opportunity, are more eager to become American citizens than those coming from governments relatively democratic, who are more content to retain the citizenship of their fatherland. The Canadians, whom we admit regardless

of quota, are least eager to acquire American citizenship, waiting an average 16.4 years.

The immigrants coming over here are of great service to our country on numerous other grounds, however, besides admission to citizenship, and on the other hand, their prime purpose in coming over is in no case to become voters here, but to improve their economic, religious, and civil status in this new "land of promise", but judging merely from their economic value to us, even the non-Nordic stock is much more needed by us than the "Nordic". We need particularly the farmers and farm-laborers, unskilled laborers and domestic servants, who greatly predominate, relatively speaking, among the "new immigrants", but today, the farm laborers constitute only 10% of our immigration, compared to 24 8/10% of the year 1914, unskilled laborers constitute today only 10%, compared to the former 18 5/10%, and servants 8%, compared to 11 8/10%. And we particularly need the wives and minor children of resident aliens, to join them here, to establish real homes for them, and the school which the children attend is the chief medium of Americanization. Even holders of American visé passports issued before the Act of 1924, after they had left their old homes on the faith of our visé and burnt all their bridges behind them, remain barred! One result has been the migration northward of hundreds of thousands of negroes, attempting to fill the role that the immigrant alien had been taking much better. But I may frankly admit that the War made it desirable temporarily somewhat further to limit immigration, in addition to the excluding force of the Act of 1917, which barred the great majority of the world by its scores of categories of excluded classes. But that concession does not justify such scheme of racial discrimination as we have enacted.

There is really nothing back of these racial restrictions other than chauvinistic ideas of supposed relative race values and race prejudices. If one turns to Jean Finot's able book on "Race Prejudice", or Oldham's recent work "Christianity and the Race Problem" one finds an excellent analysis of the movement, which began with Count Gobineau's French work of 1854, on "The Inequality of Human Races", to dignify innate prejudice, by giv-

ing it scientific appearance and terminology. Not merely do no two authorities agree on the same classification of races, but even the same individual's characteristics are described by different writers, diversely, as indicating greater or less than average racial superiority. Gobineau's theories were subsequently seized upon with avidity by the anti-Semite, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, in Germany, with slight modifications, and have latterly found their way to our country in an American guise.

Even as far as the Ku Klux Klan has adopted anti-Semitism as a plank in its platform, it has merely extended, first to Roman Catholics, and now to Jews, the animus of the old movement against the negro, and of "Know Knothingism". It is, however, a great mistake to accept Burton Hendrick's fallacious statement that the immigration restriction movement is primarily anti-Semitic. As President Eliot pointed out, some years ago, in our day it is principally anti-Catholic and in a larger view, it is merely a recrudescence of a feeling, as old as history, of suspicion and dislike against the stranger, not belonging to one's own clan or race. While anti-Semitism in our midst has taken up larger dimensions within the past few years than ever before—chiefly because of antagonism and reaction engendered by the war—this is really only a part of a much larger movement of racial discrimination, of which it is a phase, aggravated somewhat by religious, and possibly certain other differences. It is therefore a decided mistake to exaggerate its scope and significance, and overlook the fact that it is a phase of human psychology, as old as man. Even the term "Nordic", coined by a Frenchman, Deniker, was given substantial scope only by a native American, Madison Grant, in the flights of pure imagination, masquerading as race history, to be found in his recent book, "The Passing of the Great Race", and by Lothrop Stoddard's pseudo-science, and it was reserved for our native "Immigration Restriction League," and Henry Ford and his hirelings to carry the term into immigration propaganda.

Let us briefly trace to its origin this general phenomenon of racial discrimination. We all know that primitive man suspected and feared the stranger—a natural enough circumstance in days of incessant warfare, when the struggle for existence was so

much keener than now. Commonly this dislike originally even took the form of cannibalism, with the stranger as the victim. Decent treatment of the alien began at the behests of religion, when he was permitted to find refuge or asylum at the religious shrine or sacred place, where it was unseemly that human blood should be spilt. Almost every race in history, through the influence of religion, thus began to moderate the antagonism and blood-thirstiness of primitive man. I had occasion, some years ago, to trace this subject of the "Right of Asylum with Particular Reference to the Alien," historically, upon the basis of this religious sanction, in the form of a Phi Beta Kappa address, subsequently published in the "American Law Review," (1917) and somewhat further in a paper on "Un-American Character of Race Legislation," published by the American Academy of Political and Social Science, in 1909. My father, the Rev. Dr. K. Kohler has called my attention to the circumstance that the Hebrew term for stranger, "Ger," etymologically denotes "protegee" or "client" of God, evidencing the protection acquired by the alien through religious injunction, and the Biblical "cities of refuge" in terms afforded asylum to the stranger, too. (Numbers XXXVII.) It is primarily through the religious appeal that the rights of the stranger have developed, and despite occasional differences between precept and practice, we may proudly point to Biblical commandments as paving the way for racial equality. Thus Leviticus XV 34 reads: "The stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the home-born among you, and you shall love him as thyself, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." Again, to quote Exodus XII 49: "One law shall be to him that is home-born and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you." In an address by my father, delivered in 1893 at the Chicago World's Parliament of Religion on "Human Brotherhood as Taught by the Religions Based on the Bible," he emphasized not merely the civilizing influence of the acceptance by the world's three greatest religions of this corollary from the principle of the "Fatherhood of God," but also the potent humanizing and leveling effects of international commerce in developing inter-racial friendship, which religious differences in practice, as distinguished

from precept, so often tended to retard or sever. In our own day, too, it is interesting to observe that the one conspicuous systematic universal effort to establish good relations between races, regardless even of color, emanated with Prof. Felix Adler, the originator of the important "First Universal Races Congress" that was held in London in July 1911, and the papers read before which still constitute one of the most important volumes we have on the subject of race. So also, Oldham's above-cited "Christianity and the Race Problem" (1924) was written under a commission from the Board of Christian Missions.

On the other hand, so little did Greece, and then Rome, heed these dictates, that attention was properly called by a talented American Jewish scholar, A. C. Bernheim, in his interesting "History of the Laws of Aliens" to the fact that the German word "*elend*" is supposed to have been derived from the miserable condition of the foreigner, called *elento*.

Passing, however, over two thousand years to British history, we arrive at the supposedly ideal, simon-pure, ultra-desirable best exemplar of the Nordic race, whom its inamoratos wish to have strongly predominate among our new immigrant arrivals. Let us hear what Sir Harry H. Johnston, who achieved almost equal greatness as explorer, administrator, writer and anthropologist, has to say regarding the British in this connection. Writing even in the midst of the war, in 1917, on "The Alien Question" in "After War Problems," that distinguished, unbiased, authority, said:

"In our own day, thousands of Germans and still more thousands of Russian, Polish and Roumanian Jews have come to England to seek peace, a respite from religious or civic persecution, and a livelihood . . . Prior to the outbreak of the lamentable war, if any British man of genius wanted to start a new venture that was literary or dramatic, the opening up of a new country, the carrying out of a brilliant invention in industry, in chemistry, in science generally, to whom did he turn? Usually to a German, and most often to a German Jew. Facts are facts, however they may be unwelcome at this and that stage of our national history. In short, the

summing up of this historical survey is that throughout its known history, from the date of the existence of Piltdown Man to July, 1914, Britain and Ireland have not only received colonization from almost all types of the European peoples, but more than any other part of Europe, they have been enriched, stimulated, built up, into the most magnificent position that any nation has yet known in the history of the world by a succession of alien immigration. The literature of Shakespeare is virtually international; the English language is virtually international, as it has borrowed from more sources than any other example of European speech. British art and architecture are international. British science is international. We are really—we British people—the pick of Europe, because we have not shut out immigration, because we have welcomed new comers and new ideas. Put no obstacle in the path of those who are likely to prove valuable citizens. Certainly not from any superstition as to the existence of any special British race or class; seeing that we are compacted of all European types, with a dash of the Asiatic and even of the African, and that *we* do not hesitate to plant ourselves in foreign countries."

Turning next to our own country, we find here the first great nation developed, out of much varied racial and religious types, which preserved in large degree their own peculiar and distinctive characteristics, while joining in a federation of democratic states under a written constitution, which protected the stranger as well as the citizen. "E pluribus unum." As George Bancroft, the historian, well said, many years ago: "The United States were severally colonized by men in origin, religious faith and purposes as varied as their climes. *** For the entire thirteen colonies at the time of the Revolution, one-fifth of the population could not speak English, and one-half at least was not Anglo-Saxon by descent." Despite the dogmatic fallacy we so often hear repeated, as to our country having been founded by a homogeneous English Protestant stock, emanating from doctrinaires unfamiliar with our actual history, Bancroft's conclusion was confirmed by later investigations, including recent publication of the details of our first

national census, and it has been accepted by our leading living ethnologists and statisticians. In fact, as early as 1747, it was estimated that three-fifths of the entire population of Pennsylvania were Germans, and already in 1718 fears were expressed that that colony would cease to be a British province, and its governor was compelled to veto a bill forbidding further immigration into Pennsylvania "because of its cruelty." Soon this became even more pronounced in the Carolinas and Georgia. Until the end of the 18th century, the bulk of the immigrants to the colonies were "white slaves" or "redemptioners," who had to redeem themselves by service in order to pay their passage money, such as we encountered in Mary Johnston's "To Have and To Hold," and who lived under conditions which made true assimilation almost impossible.

In one section of our country, however, almost from the start, the differing immigrant was not welcomed, and that was in New England, (with the exception of Rhode Island), and it will be remembered that near the beginning of its history, Massachusetts banished her most distinguished resident, Roger Williams, compelling him to found a new home based on the since sanctified American principle of religious liberty. The pronounced extent to which some of the colonies, particularly those of New England, excluded immigrants on racial and religious lines, can be studied in Proper's "Colonial Immigration Laws." Fortunately for some of us, some of her classifications of debarrable "undesirable citizens" have not been perpetuated, for colonial Connecticut, for example, barred all lawyers. The contrast between the attitude of the Yankee and of other inhabitants of our country towards the immigrant was forcibly expressed by Senator Maclay of Pennsylvania, as far back as 1790, when in a debate on our first Naturalization Act, he said: "We Pennsylvanians act as if we believed that God made of one blood all the families of the earth, but the eastern people seem to think he made none but New England folks." Unfortunately, in our own day, Pennsylvania's Senator Reed has become the leader in Congress in advocacy of racial discrimination, and triumphed over the Rhode Island chairman of his own committee, Senator Colt.

The prevailing attitude of our country towards the foreigner, however, and of opposition to racial and religious discriminations, was, as noted, emphasized in the Declaration of Independence. Such has been our fundamental American principle concerning racial discriminations against aliens, and when in days of imminent warfare, under New England influences, during John Adams' administration, we passed the "Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798," seriously jeopardizing the rights of resident aliens, the country's revulsion of feeling was so great, that Jefferson and Madison were enabled, on this very issue, to drive the Federalists from office. Under these conditions, Jefferson penned the famous rhetorical question contained in his Presidential Message of 1801, paraphrasing a plank from the platform of the year before, on which he had been elected: "Shall we refuse the unhappy fugitives from distress that hospitality, which the savages of the wilderness extended to our forefathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe." While it is, of course, true that this declaration summarized our national attitude towards immigration until our own day, it is not generally known that in an earlier draft of this same message, Jefferson had gone back to the "natural rights" principles of the Declaration of Independence, and added a passage enunciating a theory now discarded, and which passage he subsequently eliminated from the final document, reading: "Every man has a right to live somewhere on the earth, and if somewhere, no one society has a greater right than another, to exclude him."

Of course, throughout our history, certain wise-acres and doctrinaires protested against our continuing to admit the aliens then predominately migrating to our shores, particularly the Irish and Germans, and predicted dire results from receiving such "vicious" and "non-assimilable" elements, but even the movement so graphically described by Prof. McMaster in his study of "The Riotous Career of the Know Nothings" failed to modify our general policy.

Our treatment of the negro slave, however, was to put our American doctrine of opposition to racial discrimination to a severe test, but as a result of the Civil War, we not merely liber-

ated the black slave, but even bestowed the franchise on millions of illiterate negroes unfamiliar with principles of political self-government, all in the cause of racial equality and antagonism to race discrimination.

Less liberal was our treatment of the Chinese, however, for at the insistence of the Pacific Coast, after Pres. Hayes had in 1879, vetoed as violative of treaty, a bill to exclude Chinese laborers, we negotiated a Chinese Laborer's Exclusion Treaty with China in 1880, on the basis of which we have since then gravely differentiated the treatment of the Chinese from that of other aliens at a time when our entire Chinese population was less than 106,000. Ostensibly, however, this legislative system was based upon treaty arrangement with an Asiatic power, though we thereby began to accustom ourselves to carrying admissibility of particular unpopular races of aliens into the political arena. When the Japanese became the unpopular victims of similar race prejudice along the Pacific Coast, President Roosevelt wisely, in 1906, negotiated the so-called "Gentlemen's Agreement" with Japan, by which Japan herself forbade the migration of her laborers to our shores. Almost without attention, the Immigration Law of 1917, in the midst of the War, created a "barred zone" for laborers from still other sections of Asia. When, however, an Emergency Immigration Quota Law first met with Congressional approval, in 1921, by reason of abnormal conditions and hysteria resulting from the War, President Wilson wisely vetoed the bill, as violative of fundamental American principles, and of treaty faith.

Meantime, however, soon after Pres. Roosevelt's famous message of 1906 had been penned, Congress appointed a national Immigration Commission, to study an immigration policy, and Senator Dillingham of Vermont became Chairman, and Senator Lodge of Massachusetts its most influential member. For practically the first time in our history, and from chauvinistic and political motives chiefly, a governmental commission conducted almost all its investigation in terms of race. It evolved the distinction between the so-called "new immigrant" from Southern and Eastern Europe, who had come over in predominately large numbers after 1880, and the "old immigrant" from Northern and Western

Europe, whom it is now fashionable to call of "Nordic" race. With practically no investigation into the enormous increase in the potency of the Americanizing and assimilating influences and agencies exerted upon the "new immigrant," or into the actual extent of what James Bryce ably called his "eager and willing assimilation," he was contrasted in this respect with mythical "old immigrants." As it was impossible to study the conditions of all foreign born or foreign stock, certain sections of the country were arbitrarily selected, where conditions were most unfavorable to him, and inferences on a percentage basis drawn, commonly based upon an infinitesimally small number of cases. The fact was disregarded that, necessarily, large percentages of recently arrived "new immigrants" were not here long enough to average up with the "old" in percentage naturalized, or who had become masters of our vernacular, and misleading relative percentages were widely circulated. The fact was ignored that the prudent immigrant,—coming over with scarcely any money, and forbidden by our contract labor laws to secure a position beforehand—if married, generally preceded wife and children, in order to be able to establish a home for them first, before sending for them, and the "new immigrant" was styled "a bird of passage," though the old immigrant had done substantially the same thing in his day. Even as it was, however, the Immigration Commission felt compelled—while classifying the Jewish immigrant with the "new immigration"—to concede that his characteristics were predominatingly those of the "old" (Vol. I, p 181, 187). Shortly before the Immigration Commission began its investigations, Congress had stricken out a direction to investigate population in terms of race in the "Census Bill," and when representatives of our own faith objected before the Immigration Commission to injecting certain "religious or racial discriminations" into its investigations, Senator Lodge replied (Vol. 41, p. 269):

"The word 'race' was stricken out of the census bill. I think it was a great mistake. It makes the returns almost valueless."

Even as it was, however, wide-scaled investigation made by Prof. Franz Boas on behalf of the Immigration Commission, in-

volving native-born Jewish and South Italian children in New York, showed how ephemeral and evanescent even the supposedly most tenacious racial characteristic, the shape of the skull, is, in our country, the long skulls of the former growing decidedly shorter than their progenitors', even in the second generation, while the round skulls of the latter grow longer than their ancestors'. This is the result of environment, climate and food, causing even the so-called "cephalic-index" thereby governed, to approximate to that of the so-called native American stock. It is this "Index" which is the chief factor underlying theories of race classification, such as the so-called "Nordic" races differentiation from other races. This is the only large-scaled scientific investigation of race and environment ever made. Although the scheme of restricting immigration by national quotas, based on such numbers of residents, was submitted to the Immigration Commission, it was discarded in its recommendations in 1910, in favor of the Literacy Test, which finally was enacted in 1917. It is not without interest to note that this national quota scheme was first suggested by Rev. S. L. Gulick, a missionary who had resided in Japan for a long time, and evolved it, in order to avoid friction with the Orient. I had occasion to warn him about 15 years ago, that it would not solve the Japanese question, but it would cause untold mischief for other race groups, as well, and also serious injury to our country at large. Naturally, when one is embarked on a course of racial discrimination, the most unpopular races come off worst of all. The act of 1924 not merely gives Japan a purely nominal quota, but it bars Japanese of nearly all classes, by excluding persons racially not naturalizable, and starts a new course in our treatment of Oriental immigration by excluding permanently, even the wives of American citizens of Chinese and Japanese race, resident here.

Since Edmund Burke's day, it has become axiomatic that one cannot draw an indictment against a whole nation. Who are the nationalities primarily discriminated against on the score of racial inferiority? Greek immigration would really wholly stop, though every civilized being knows what the world owes to Greece in the fields of literature, science, art and democratic government. Italy

is discriminated against, to whom civilization owes so much in the fields of government, law, literature, art, music and navigation, including the gift of the discoverer of the New World. Poland is, which saved all Europe from the Turks scarcely two centuries ago, and was once in the van in culture; Russia, which gave us in our own day a Tolstoi and a Turgenev, and a Jewish Jean de Bloch, to inspire the Czar with Hague Convention plans for terminating warfare! And there are the Jews, whose contributions to the world of religion, of standards of righteous conduct, literature and commerce, can scarcely be overvalued. As said by Mathew Arnold in his "Literature and Dogma": "Greece was the lifter-up to the nations of the banner of art and science, as Israel was the lifter-up of the banner of righteousness. Conduct, plain matter as it is, is six-eighths of life, while art and science are only two-eighths." More recently, in Cushing's charming newly published "Life of Sir William Osler," that distinguished scientist's address of 1914 on the "Jew in Medicine" is quoted, where he said:

"Modern civilization is the outcome of (these) two great movements of the mind of man, who today is ruled in heart and head by Israel and by Greece. From the one he has learned responsibility to a Supreme Being and the love of his neighbor, in which are embraced both the Law and the Prophets; from the other he has gathered the promise of Eden to have dominion over the earth in which he lives. Not that Israel is all heart, nor Greece all head, for in estimating the human value of the two races, intellect and science are found in Jerusalem and beauty and truth at Athens, but in different proportions."

After brilliantly summarizing the history of the Jew in medicine, he concluded:

"In the medical profession the Jews have a long and honorable record, and among no people is all that is best in our science and art more warmly appreciated; none in the community take more to heart the admonition of the son of Sirach—: 'Give place to the physician, let him not go from thee, for thou hast need of him'."

Not unmindful of the natural indignation of the "new immigrants" and their one-time mother countries at such offensive and humiliating relative race valuations, the House Committee on Immigration, in its report actually contended that the new immigrant "breeds racial hatreds, which should not exist in the United States," instead of recognizing that such un-American and vicious methods of treating him ought to be so characterized! Fortunately, our late Secretary of State, Judge Hughes, had the courage at least to try publicly to stem this tide, and the Federation of Protestant Churches was not unmindful of their obligations to inculcate in practice, the principles of the true "brotherhood of man." President Coolidge has also lately tried to stem this tide of racial discrimination, and this very month, the federal courts, with Judge Augustus N. Hand of New York as their spokesman, strongly condemned this whole point of view.

But such a festering sore as attempted governmental racial discrimination cannot be confined to immigration questions. Given a habit of making relative racial evaluations, race prejudice and racial suspicion will rapidly spread into the most unexpected fields. But a year or two ago, the professor of social ethics at Harvard actually suggested the establishment of racial quotas for college admission, in line with a similar suggestion from Pres. Lowell, but fortunately the governing board of Harvard unanimously disapproved of such recalcitrancy to the Harvard traditions! No mere questions of restriction of immigration is involved in this departure from fundamental American principles. And the circumstance that some of us delude ourselves by invoking pseudo-scientific arguments in support of such tests, was never formulated more strikingly than by a distinguished Harvard professor, Josiah Royce, who, in writing on "Race Questions and Prejudices" as far back as 1908, well said:

"We are all prone to confuse the accidental with the essential, * * * to use science to support most of our personal prejudice * * * Superiority is best known by good deeds and few boasts;"

and he pointed out that we first permit our prejudices to give names and classifications to race distinctions, and then worship

these fetishes, because we have given them scientific names and terminology. He concludes that

“Such trained hatreds are peculiarly pathetic and peculiarly deceitful, because they combine in such a subtle way, the elemental vehemence of the hatred that a child may feel for a stranger, or a cat for a dog, with the appearance of dignity and solemnity and even of duty which a name gives. But what we can do about them is to try not to be fooled by them, not to take them too seriously, because of their mere name.”

The fathers of our republic established it avowedly and intentionally, on the basis of equality of rights, regardless of race and creed. In some sections of New England, moreover, the Old Testament was enacted into civil law, including its command: “One law shall be to him that is home-born and unto the stranger that sojourneth with you”. Will the sober sense of the country permit us, while continuing to do lip-service to these fundamental principles, to substitute for them, a regime of absurd race discrimination and race segregation? That is the most important question raised by the Immigration law of 1924.

THE JEWISH COLONIZATION WORK IN RUSSIA

AN EFFORT TO SOLVE THE RUSSIAN-JEWISH QUESTION IN RUSSIA

By JAMES N. ROSENBERG*

Through the aid of the Joint Distribution Committee 50,000 Jews have settled on 500,000 acres of fertile land in the Ukraine and the Crimea. There, as pioneers, they are bravely and successfully beginning a new life. Statistical and geographical details are dull. Hence I shall not dwell on my visits to some 50 of the colonies, my meetings with the leading Jews of Moscow, Odessa, Simferopol, Kherson and other cities. I shall try rather in this brief address to present the questions which I have asked myself in regard to this historic movement to the soil of the Russian Jew and the answers to those inquiries.

Does the Russian Jew really wish to settle on the soil; if so, why? Does he wish to stay on the soil, and again, wherefore? What is the attitude of the leaders of Russian Jewry towards this movement; what the attitude of Soviet Russia? Lastly, will the Jew on the soil succeed economically and will he continue to live, in religion and spirit, as a Jew?

Over one hundred leaders of Russian Jewry with whom I conferred were to a man enthusiastically in support of the work. Their view was well expressed by a distinguished Jewish scientist who spoke at a great meeting in Moscow. After stating that the Moscow Jews, poor as they are, were then conducting a campaign to raise 400,000 roubles for the colonization work, he declared that the land settlement work (I quote from his words):

*On January 11th, 1925, Mr. Rosenberg delivered an address before the Judaeans on the above subject. In view of the progress of the work since that date, he re-wrote his address to speak as of the present time at the request of the editors.

“is much more than an economic matter. It means much more than changing families into productive citizens. It frees the soul of Russian Jewry. It opens a new life to us. Every Jew in Russia feels a sense of release through this work. For the first time we Jews of Russia are able to put our roots into the soil, the same as the rest of the people in this country.”

Such was the point of view I found expressed everywhere in Russia. The Ozet, a non-political society of Russian Jews organized to further land settlement, has a membership of 50,000 Russian Jews. You will see then the depth and breadth of the movement in Russia.

I come now to the question of the relationship of Soviet Russia towards the work. I prefer to judge governments by deeds rather than by words. In this year alone the Government has made land grants to Jewish settlers of over 500,000 acres of the famous black soil which has for generations been the granary of Europe. These acres had a pre-war value of not less than \$12,000,000. The Government has also this year given lumber of a value of \$250,000 and upwards of \$1,000,000 in long term credits to enable our settlers to purchase farm machinery and to help them in house building. Is not that an astounding record? What Government in all history, in all the world, has done anything like this? We hark back to the contrast of those days when President Taft cancelled age-long treaties with Russia because of her oppression of the Jew. I wish there were time for me to tell in detail of my conferences in Moscow with the leaders of the Soviet Government in charge of the Jewish land settlement. They are enthusiastically in support of the work, agree that it has been splendidly productive.

After all, however, the crux of this land settlement work lies in the response, not of the leading Jews, not even of the Government, but of the settlers themselves. What do they think; what do they want; how do they feel? It was to find the answer to these queries that I visited the colonies in the Ukraine and the Crimea. I made it my invariable rule to ask the settlers—the old

men and young, the women, boys, girls, children,—whether they wanted to go back to the towns and the villages. I measure my words when I declare that, though I asked that question of not less than 500 people, not a man, woman or child wanted to go back to the city. Though 10,000 families have already settled, there are today upwards of 40,000 families registered as applicants for an opportunity to go to the land.

What is the reason for this spontaneous urge to the soil? The answer is learned only too soon when one visits Russia. The political ideology of the Soviet Government is such that the hideous anti-Semitism of Czaristic days is discouraged. Thank God, persecution of the Jew is no longer there a Government policy. Economically, however, that tremendous event, the Russian Revolution, has completely put out of adjustment the great bulk of the Russian Jewish population. Prior to the Revolution, as we all know, nearly all the Jews were herded in the Pale and mostly compelled to become small traders. What a plight is theirs today! The Government-owned business and industry and the great Russian cooperatives destroy the little traders, the little artisans. They have no place in the economic scheme of present-day Russia. But worse than that, the small trader is today what in Russia is called a declassed citizen. I cannot begin to describe to you the dreadful lot of the declassed. To realize it one must be in Russia. A poor Jew who is a small trader needs an operation at the hospital. It is a matter of life and death to him. But the hospital cannot find place or doctor for him, since the favored categories of citizens, the workers and the peasants, come first. So the poor Jew cannot get into the hospital and he dies. His child wants to get into school. No room. The school is for the children of the workmen and peasants. He wants to have a roof to cover his head. But there are not enough roofs to go around, and the houses are allotted to the workmen and the peasants. At every point the little Jewish trader, as a declassed member of society, suffers incalculably.

On the soil, *per contra*, he is politically and legally the favored person. The background of Russia's economic strength is in her land and her crops. The Jew on the land not only puts his roots

into the soil, but enters into the very core of Russian life. Is it a wonder then that invariably the Jew laughed in scorn at the idea of returning to the city?

These then are the answers to my questions. But there remains another question: What of Jewish life in the colonies? What of the Jewish life of the spirit? Of our faith? The religion of our forefathers? I was in the colonies on two Saturdays. The tractors were idle. The peasants were resting, and where they could gather a *minyan* they were worshipping. In the cities—in Moscow, in Simferopol,—in the industrial life of the factory, the Jew must work on Saturday. He can't help it. He must adjust himself to the economic urban life. On the land in his own village, the Sabbath is a holy day—a day of rest. In little homes in the colonies I saw the Torah. Everywhere the men asked that we build synagogues for them, so I venture to express the confident belief that on the vast steppes of Russia, we shall see a profound spiritual quickening of the Jewish soul. I was deeply touched when a delegation of little children asked that we build a school for them. We are the people of the Book. And on the great steppes once economic life is re-established, the Jew will, I believe, with renewed fervor, pray to the God of Israel.

No page of history records such oppressions and horrors as those to which the Russian Jews have been subjected during the last half-century—the notorious Ignatiev May laws of 1881, herding the Jew in the Pale; the pogroms beginning then and recurring constantly; Kishineff; Bialistock; Gomel; the Beiliss case, charging ritual murder against the whole Jewish people; then for a climax, the horrors of 1914 to 1921—war, famine, pestilence,—the cyclone of widespread death. The Spanish Inquisition fades against these chapters of terror. Can men and women who have been so beaten down lift up their heads? The pictures I have seen of these hardy Jews on the soil, these brave pioneers, thrill me with the hope, the conviction, that, given only a bare chance, these men and women will win the battle they are so splendidly waging. Surely at least they deserve our help to the uttermost.

THE WORLD COURT AND THE PROTECTION OF RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS MINORITIES*

ADDRESS BY HON. SAMSON LACHMAN, *Chairman*

We are varying our proceeding somewhat tonight. Our custom for some time past has been to entertain distinguished guests from foreign lands, and secure information from them as to the condition of our people in various countries, and as to the means which have been adopted to alleviate their distress, and to put them back on the road to recuperation and happiness. We have had individual reports from France, Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Russia, and Poland.

But tonight the question is one that interests the entire civilized world. The action of our governing bodies is very anxiously awaited. The devotees of peace, the advocates of harmony and of friendly feeling are anxious that we should support a tribunal, a World Court, to which can be submitted questions which will do away with the conflict, the bitterness, and the antagonisms which have arisen from conflict—a court with a broad, strong and beneficent sanction, whose action is based on the submission to calm, deliberate, and impartial judicial thought, questions which are capable of legal decision.

The Jewish people are certainly interested in the establishment and maintenance of a World Court which will recognize their rights, grudgingly granted at first. The whole world looks with hope and confidence to a court of this character, whose conclusions will be based on the deliberate argument of matters which they can dispose of in accordance with the dictates of humanity and of abstract rights, and to be enforced by the united feeling instilled by international jurisprudence. Promises which have been made without the intention of having them observed will be

*Addresses delivered at a meeting held January 17, 1926.

fulfilled, and equity will take the place of force and stubborn resistance.

Our friend and fellow member, Louis Marshall, I think, has not appeared on our platform since the very interesting verbal tilt which he had with Mr. Israel Zangwill some time ago. Mr. Marshall was very active in assisting in the introduction of the declarations of minority rights. His latest vacation was spent in the peaceful environment of Geneva, endeavoring to vivify the mandates which many people thought were moribund. He will tell us tonight of the treaties and of these special declarations and of the efforts which have been made to circumvent them and the means of defeating these efforts by peaceful and legal methods.

ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS MARSHALL

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen: If the average good citizen of the City of New York or of any part of the country were asked to tell us what the minority treaties are or what is meant by the expression "racial, linguistic, and religious minorities," he would have great difficulty in making any intelligible statement, principally because he knows nothing about the subject. I suppose that the same result would follow if you asked him to give specific information about the constitution of the United States, although he is presumed to know something about that. Assuming, therefore, that even those who are here tonight have not spent much time in informing themselves in regard to the treaties, I shall venture, in order to give a background to the statements which will be made by those who are to speak this evening to give as clear an account of the treaties as it is possible to do in the time which is allotted to me.

These treaties were entered into by the great powers with the various new and enlarged states that emerged out of the turmoil of the war and out of the deliberations that took place in Paris in 1919. The contracting parties were, first, the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan. The parties with whom

these treaties were made were Poland, Rumania, Czecho-Slovakia, Jugo-Slavia, Bulgaria, Austria, Hungary, Turkey, Albania and other states; and there were also so-called declarations accepting the principles laid down in these treaties, entered into by states which were received into the League of Nations as a condition of their reception there, as, for instance, Latvia, Lithuania, and Esthonia and to a certain extent, also, Finland. The making of such treaties was contemplated in the peace treaties entered into between the great powers and their allies with Austria, Germany, and the other governments which had been at war with the allied and associated powers.

In Article 93 of the treaty with Germany it was provided as follows: "Poland accepts and agrees to embody in her treaty with the principal allied and associated powers such provisions as may be deemed necessary by the said powers to protect the interests of the inhabitants of Poland which differ from the majority of the population in race, language, and religion." Similar provisions were contained in other of the peace treaties with the principal belligerents so that it was foreshadowed that the main treaty would be followed by the specific treaties with respect to the protection of the rights of these minorities described as "racial, linguistic, and religious."

Now, the reason why such treaties were insisted upon is to be found in the history of Europe during many centuries and particularly during the nineteenth century. It was found that there had been no attempt upon the part of various of the governments of Europe to protect their minorities. They were in some of the countries in a state of helotism; they had no civil, religious, or political rights. They were merely tolerated. In Russia, for instance, the Jews were required to remain within the pale of settlement, where they were immured in what constituted less than one two thousandth of the area of Russia, and there they were subjected to all manner of restrictive laws and regulations which made life unbearable to them. The same thing was true in Rumania, where between 1878 and 1919 two hundred and fifty-two restrictive laws were enacted which were aimed principally at the Jews.

What was true of the Jews was likewise true of other nationalities and adherents to other religious faiths. What was a grave situation prior to the war became a much more serious one in consequence of the establishment of the new states and the enlargement of existing states in Eastern Europe, in many of which new populations were introduced that spoke different languages, followed different religions, and were of different racial stocks from those of the nationality constituting the majority. It was, therefore, quite naturally anticipated that, unless something were done for the protection of these minorities, there would prevail constant controversy and ill will, jealousy, hostility, internal and external conflict, and even rebellion. There had been a striking illustration in 1878 of the necessity that treaties of this nature should be supported by effective sanctions. A treaty which is without a background of that sort is merely a scrap of paper in the literal sense of the term.

In 1878, at the end of the Turkish-Russian War, there assembled in Berlin, the historic Congress in which the great powers of Europe participated, including England, under the leadership of Disraeli and Salisbury. There was France with Waddington at the head of her delegation. Italy and Austria were active. Germany was represented by Bismarck and Russia by Gortschakoff. New states were there created—Rumania, Serbia, Bulgaria—and it was found necessary that in the treaty which created these new states, there should be an assurance by each government about to be created that it would protect at least the religious minorities. Language and race had not at that time taken so prominent a part in political discussion. There was a specific provision that all who dwelt in these different countries were to have equal rights, regardless of faith and creed.

The Jews supposed that these pledges would bring to them a new era of happiness; that in Rumania, where they lived to the number of three hundred thousand, they would have the same rights as their neighbors, some of them and their ancestors having lived there from five to eight centuries. They were really the oldest stock in certain parts of Rumania. But the moment these states were created, there followed an absolute disregard, at least

in Rumania, of the obligations which had been assumed under the treaty. That government at once began to seek a way to get around the language of the treaty, which had not been drawn with adequate care because it was not anticipated that its spirit would not prevail. But acting on the arbitrary theory that before a person could become entitled to the guaranteed rights, he would have to be a citizen and upon the pitiable technicality that the Jews, who had dwelt in Rumania for five or six or eight centuries, had not been naturalized, and had never been regarded as citizens, it would be necessary for them to be naturalized before the treaty would be regarded as conferring upon them the intended rights, Rumania put clauses into her constitution to the effect that nobody should be naturalized except by special act of parliament. There was to be no wholesale naturalization of the so-called aliens. The result was that, acting upon that plan, between 1878 and 1919 not to exceed one hundred of the three hundred thousand Jews in Rumania were naturalized, and the treaty therefore became a dead letter. When, therefore, the Peace Conference met in Paris, it was considered as necessary to present to that conference and to its leaders, the facts to which I have called attention, and to ask that this time there should be adopted a series of treaties which would be really protective and which would be accompanied by legal sanctions.

The first treaty that was drafted was the treaty between the great powers and Poland. Months of continuous and intense effort was devoted to the formulation of this treaty so that it would safeguard and protect the rights of those who were sought to be protected. I had the high privilege to be in Paris during all the time while these treaties were under discussion and the greater privilege of working side by side with Mr. David Hunter Miller and with Professor Hudson, who is here tonight, both of whom did an enormous amount of work in conjunction with Mr. Headlam-Morley of Great Britain, M. Philippe Berthelot of France, Signor DiMartino of Italy, and Mr. Adatci of Japan, in shaping this treaty and the others into the form in which they were finally adopted. It would be unpardonable did I not now avail myself of this opportunity, as I have never failed whenever I have dis-

cussed these treaties, to call attention to the inestimable obligation of the civilized world to Woodrow Wilson, to Colonel House, to M. Clemenceau, and to Lloyd George in respect to the creation of these treaties.

Now, it is desirable to have before us, when we discuss this momentous document, which ranks among the greatest state papers in the world's history, the text of the instrument. The treaty was written both in French and in English. I shall confine myself to the English text. After reading the various recitals—the first article will be found to be of the utmost importance. It reads as follows:

“Poland undertakes that the stipulations contained in Articles 2 to 8 of this chapter shall be recognized as fundamental laws, and that no law, regulation or official action shall conflict or interfere with these stipulations, nor shall any law, regulation or official action prevail over them.”

In other words, these provisions were made the supreme law of the several governments which entered into these treaties, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania, and so on.

Then followed Article 2: “Poland undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Poland without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion.”

You will observe that it says nothing about property. In our constitution we speak of “life, liberty and property.”

“All inhabitants of Poland shall be entitled to the free exercise, whether public or private, of any creed, religion or belief, whose practices are not inconsistent with public order or public morals.”

Then follow a number of articles which provide, in substance, that the members of these various minorities that have been described, who have lived in these countries—I shall say Poland by way of illustration—who have lived in Poland, *ipso facto* become citizens of Poland, unless they decide to exercise the option of becoming or remaining citizens of the government of which they had previously been subjects—that is they *ipso facto* become citizens of Poland by the adoption of the treaty and the

indication of their desire to become citizens, but without the necessity of naturalization or of performing any act which would be a condition precedent to the creation of citizenship. Birth was also considered. Birth within the territory was made an important element in the determination of citizenship. A person became a citizen of Poland, even though such a person, born within the confines of Poland, may have been in another country at the time when the treaty went into effect.

Then came Article 5: "Poland undertakes to put no hindrance in the way of the exercise of the right which the persons concerned have, under the Treaties concluded or to be concluded by the Allied and Associated Powers with Germany, Austria, Hungary or Russia, to choose whether or not they will acquire Polish nationality."

"6. All persons born in Polish territory who are not born nationals of another State shall *ipso facto* become Polish nationals."

"7. All Polish nationals shall be equal before the law and shall enjoy the same civil and political rights without distinction as to race, language or religion.

"Differences of religion, creed or confession shall not prejudice any Polish national in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil or political rights, as for instance, admission to public employments, functions and honors, or the exercise of professions and industries.

"No restriction shall be imposed on the free use by any Polish national of any language in private intercourse, in commerce, in religion, in the press or in publications of any kind, or at public meetings.

"Notwithstanding any establishment by the Polish Government of an official language, adequate facilities shall be given to Polish nationals of non-Polish speech for the use of their language, either orally or in writing, before a court.

"8. Polish nationals who belong to racial, religious or linguistic minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as the other Polish nationals. In

particular, they shall have an equal right to establish, manage and control at their own expense charitable, religious and social institutions, schools and other educational establishments, with the right to use their own language and to exercise their religion freely therein."

Then follow various clauses as to education until we come to Article 11. It is the only article in which Jews are mentioned. The purpose of this treaty was that all nationals, all races, and all religions were to have equal rights; there was no desire to secure special rights or special privileges for the Jews:

"Jews shall not be compelled to perform any act which constitutes a violation of their Sabbath, nor shall they be placed under any disability by reason of their refusal to attend courts of law or to perform any legal business on their Sabbath. This provision, however, shall not exempt Jews from such obligations as shall be imposed upon all other Polish citizens for the necessary purposes of military service, national defence or the preservation of public order.

"Poland declares her intention to refrain from ordering or permitting elections, whether general or local, to be held on a Saturday, nor will registration for electoral or other purposes be compelled to be performed on a Saturday."

These outstanding principles of government and of human rights are thus announced in these treaties in the most direct and unambiguous terms. So far as the protection of those rights is concerned, there was no provision up to this point in the treaties which would give us any more sanction for the protection of the rights of these minorities than that which was conferred in the Treaty of Berlin, by the assent of Rumania, and the other East European governments which were then established.

Of course, these treaties were entered into by great nations most of which possessed noble traditions of liberty and justice and also had great power, but there was something more required than power and tradition. It was necessary in the case of these nations to do what every business man does when he enters into a contract with another, that is, to determine what remedies

he will have if the obligations which have been entered into are not kept. Therefore we find Article 12, which ties the minority treaties to the World Court; and in accomplishing that a new departure in international law occurred by the creation of new principles, of new remedies, and of new methods of dealing between nations. Article 12 reads as follows:

“Poland agrees that the stipulations in the foregoing Articles, so far as they affect persons belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities, constitute obligations of international concern and shall be placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations.”

In 1878, before this was done, Rumania said, “It is none of your business, England, France, Italy, Austria, Germany, what we do with our minorities. It is a matter of our own concern. We are dealing with our own people in our own country.” But these treaties declare that it is a matter of international concern, and that these rights are to be placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations.

The article continues:

“They (these stipulations) shall not be modified without the assent of a majority of the Council of the League of Nations. The United States, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan hereby agree not to withhold their assent from any modification in these articles which is in due form assented to by a majority of the Council of the League of Nations.

“Poland agrees that any member of the Council of the League of Nations shall have the right to bring to the attention of the Council any infraction, or any danger of infraction, of any of these obligations, and that the Council may thereupon take such action and give such direction as it may deem proper and effective in the circumstances.”

The right was thereby given to any nation that had a member in the Council or through a member to bring to the attention of the Council any infraction of the treaties.

“Poland further agrees that any difference of opinion as to questions of law or fact arising out of these Articles between

the Polish Government and any one of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers or any other Power, a Member of the Council of the League of Nations, shall be held to be a dispute of an international character under Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Polish Government hereby consents that any such dispute shall, if the other party thereto demands, be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice. The decision of the Permanent Court shall be final and shall have the same force and effect as an award under Article 13 of the Covenant."

Here we have a tribunal which is to determine any controverted questions of fact or of law. We no longer are dependent upon the honesty or the good will of any particular nation. We have the *international conscience* at work and we have a matter of *international concern* which is to be determined by an *international court* which proceeds not upon political considerations, but solely as a judicial tribunal upon considerations of law.

It has been asked what is meant by the phrase "an obligation of international concern?" Why should the obligations of these treaties be placed under the guaranty of the League of Nations or the disputes regarding them referred "to the Permanent Court of International Justice?" To me, the answers are simple. It was the desire of those who were gathered at the Peace Conference and who were engaged in establishing new states and of enlarging the boundaries of existing sovereignties by adding populations which had formerly belonged to other sovereignties, that nothing should be done that would produce new causes for friction and dissatisfaction and that none of those who dwelt within the boundaries of these new and enlarged states should be subjected to hateful discriminations, persecution or oppression. It was with reason believed, judging from age-long experience, that it would be the tendency of those in the majority to dominate over those of other faiths, of varying racial origins and speaking different languages and who constituted numerical minorities. It was deemed inevitable that unless these minorities were assured equality of civil, political and religious rights with the majority,

it would give rise not only to internal discord, but would create international enmities on the part of those who were racially, religiously and linguistically of kin to the minorities. These new and enlarged states which had come to the Peace Conference urging the grant of sovereignty, or of increased territory within which resided not only a homogeneous majority but, likewise, various minorities whose inclusion was in many instances involuntary, as of Germans, Austrians, Jews, and Ukrainians in Poland, of Hungarians, Germans, Russians and Jews in Rumania and of like accession in other countries. In order, therefore, to avoid what otherwise would have occasioned inevitable conflicts with and the resultant oppression of minorities and alarming disturbances of world peace, it was concluded not only that the Bill of Rights that conferred upon these minorities the accompanying grant of citizenship to those who did not possess it, was to become the supreme law of these various sovereignties, but that the enjoyment of these rights was also to be guaranteed by the League of Nations. It did not, however, suffice to obtain from these new and expanded sovereignties promises and covenants that they would observe the obligations set forth in the treaties. That would only have amounted to a repetition of what had occurred in 1878. It is true that these minority treaties were couched in terms so clear that they could not be evaded, but it was within the range of possibility that they might nevertheless be deliberately disregarded. The question would then arise as to what could be done to enforce them. Was it to be left to the governments of these several States or to their own judicial tribunals to determine whether or not they had violated their own treaties? What would have been the status of these minorities and whence would have come their protection against retaliation, had it been left to them to seek a remedy against their own sovereign in its tribunals? The futility of such a situation was at once apparent, and for that reason it was not only declared that the obligations of these treaties were not merely the concern of the members of the several minorities or of the countries in which these minorities lived, but it was agreed that it was a matter that concerned all the world; that it gave rise to an international problem

over which the Council of the League of Nations itself or through the Permanent Court of International Justice was to exercise jurisdiction in the interest of universal peace as well as of humanity by taking cognizance of any actual or menaced violation of the treaty obligations. Such an infraction of the treaties thus became a matter of international concern in the same sense that the violation of the Constitution of the United States by one of the States of the Union is a matter of national concern, as to which the Supreme Court of the United States has the power to adjudicate.

Since these treaties have been taken under the control of the League of Nations and since it has undertaken to carry out the guarantee which it has given that they shall be observed, there has grown up a procedure which is very liberal and has been admirably worked out by Signor Tittoni and Sir Gilbert Murray and others, who have given thought to the subject. Regulations have been adopted which liberalize the procedure, so that if any violation or threatened violation of the rights of a minority takes place that minority itself, if it couches its complaint in respectful language, may file in the Secretariat at Geneva its complaint, with a statement of the facts. That complaint is thereupon submitted to a committee of the council, and the subject is thoroughly investigated, and if it is found that there is merit in the complaint, it is then taken up by the Council for action, and if any questions of fact or of law remain to be determined, those questions are submitted for determination to the World Court. Each of the parties is entitled to be heard. If desired, any nation which is concerned in the controversy is permitted to intervene in the court, so that no decision is reached until after the fullest hearing and consideration, and I repeat, every question is determined on its merits according to the principles of law and justice, and not, as too often happens, in arbitral bodies, according to political or other considerations.

There have been two cases before the World Court which illustrate the effectiveness of the treaties and the importance of that tribunal, which is the final judge as to whether or not the treaties have been observed. Those two cases are known as cases

number 6 and number 7 of the advisory opinions of the Court. They were decided in September, 1923. The parties in controversy were Germany, not even a member of the League of Nations, and Poland, and the rights which were sought to be protected were the rights of Germans who had lived in the territory which had been annexed to Poland by the operation of the Treaty of Versailles. I wish that I could read to you the opinions that were there rendered. They are worthy of the exalted tribunal which pronounced them.

The court considered the history of these treaties and the purpose sought to be accomplished and gave them a broad interpretation for the purpose of carrying out the salutary object which was in mind when these treaties were entered into. In each case the treaties were upheld and applied for the benefit of the minorities. In one case it was a matter of contract rights, in the other it related to rights of citizenship; but in each instance the interpretation given to the treaties was such as appeals to the sense of right and justice of every well-constituted man.

This is the test which has been applied: The court has indicated by its method of procedure how it will deal with matters arising under these treaties. It has given a reasonable interpretation to the language. It has avoided technicalities. It has determined each case upon its merits, and each case in conformity with proper rules of interpretation and established principles of international law.

If there ever was any doubt in our minds as to how this World Court would act, that doubt is entirely obviated by the manner in which that tribunal has acted in these two instances. When I say that the opinions that were rendered and the method of procedure and the method of approach of the Court to the questions bear comparison with the finest traditions of the Supreme Court of the United States in its best period, I am giving it the highest praise that can be given to any human tribunal.

I therefore feel that the question which is now before the American people as to whether we shall participate in the World Court is one that can be determined, not in accordance with untried theories, but in accordance with actual experience. We know just exactly what kind of tribunal we have. People who were afraid

of the advisory opinions, I think, will have to revise their ideas when they come to read the judgments rendered by the Court in these cases. They indicate, to me at least, that the most valuable work done by the World Court is that connected with the rendition of its advisory opinions.

I hope that I have at least indicated to you that the treaties which have been discussed are of vital importance. As Mr. Colban, a distinguished member of the Secretariat in Geneva, who is not only a statesman but a genius and who has charge of the minorities bureau said to me while I visited with him last summer: "The only thing that stands between destruction and thirty-five million human beings are these treaties." They are therefore worthy of preservation, support and protection.

I know that you will be anxious to learn more about the World Court, and I therefore take this opportunity to recommend to you a reading of Professor Hudson's book on the "Permanent Court of International Justice," and the volume recently written by Mr. De Bustamente, one of the judges of the World Court, one of the great jurists of the western world, who represents Cuba, and who is a man whose writings and judgments indicate that he is gifted with a colossal intellect.

In conclusion, let me refer to a misconception which has from time to time prevailed in some circles as to the nature of these minority rights. It has been asked whether they do not create what is called an *imperium in imperio*. They do not, in any sense, of the term. They merely write into the fundamental laws of the nations which have accepted the obligations of these treaties for the protection of their citizens, the same principles of equality before the law, of liberty of conscience, liberty of speech, liberty of the press, as are to be found in the Constitution of the United States and of the several States of our Union. Their adoption here was not for the protection of those in the majority, but of those who are in the minority, as at times every individual citizen is, as contrasted with the entire population of the country. In East European countries, the existence of large minorities is only more evident than it is with us.

The most careful analysis of the terms of these treaties fails

to disclose in them a single element which is not to be found in the American Constitution, and in those of other countries whose organic law is in written form, nor do they differ from those well-known constitutional though unwritten principles formulated and enforced for the protection of the subjects of Great Britain. These minorities have not had conferred upon them autonomous governmental powers. They cannot legislate. They are not separated from the mass of the citizenry of the lands to which they owe allegiance. What have been guaranteed to them are the same individual rights that we cherish and which constitute our charter of liberties. It is a matter of life and death for the minorities of Eastern Europe that they shall be protected in the rights and liberties which have come to them through these treaties and which otherwise they would not have been given an opportunity to enjoy. The advantages that the nations to which these treaties apply will derive from a faithful observance of their provisions are not as yet fully appreciated, but it is inevitable that ere long they will prove an inestimable blessing to all of them. Such observance will foster mutual confidence and friendship among all their inhabitants and contribute to the creation and preservation of peace, unity and harmony as well as the growth of spiritual and material progress in all of these lands.

THE CHAIRMAN: As we have learned from the last speaker, Professor Manley O. Hudson, of Harvard University, is one of the greatest authorities, specialists, and experts on the question that we have under discussion tonight. He took part in the preparation of the treaties and of the declarations in Paris. He was engaged there actively in the legal division of the work. He has kept up his interest ever since.

ADDRESS BY PROF. MANLEY O. HUDSON

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen: It is a great pleasure to be permitted to take part in your discussion of the World Court and the protection of racial, religious, and linguistic minorities: I am happy to find myself working side by

side again with my friend, the Honorable Louis Marshall. The only disadvantage about following him is that, of course, after Mr. Marshall has gone over the subject, there is little left for other people to say.

I have long been interested in the problem of protecting minorities, which seems to me to be one of the most delicate of all international problems. In the first place, it is most important in any particular country of the world, that the government of that country should have the allegiance of the people who live there, and should be able to unite those people in behalf of the policies which the government lays down. I think it must not be lost sight of, in discussing the question of protection of minorities, that no government in the world can possibly afford a division within its own population based upon intervention from the outside, which is going to threaten the very existence of that government. On the other hand, there are, in many countries, particular groups of people who have a solidarity for racial or religious or linguistic reasons, which it is most important that they should be permitted to perpetuate as against a control or domination by another part of the population of their own country. I speak of groups to include both the group which may hold itself together by some tie of race or language or religion and the individuals who compose that group.

One does not need to look afar to know that it must be a delicate balance that can be maintained at best between this principle of local allegiance on the one hand and the principle of group solidarity on the other hand. We have had considerable experience in this North American continent with various minorities, and I am sure that, as we read the history of North America, none of us can be very proud of the way in which we have handled our own minority problems.

Why does it happen that this minority problem may be an international problem? I believe there are two reasons. The first is that the peace of the world may be threatened by the unrest of people within a particular state. The second is that the peace of the world is bound to be threatened whenever the condition of a

people is such that it may lead others outside a country to organize an expedition to free their brethren inside that country.

Of course, when the international character of the problem is once admitted, there are distinct limits to the possibilities of international action. International intervention cannot be envisaged in any large or particularly general terms.

I should like to find, if it were possible, some problem which might arise in the lives of our peoples of North America, which might be somewhat comparable to the problems that may arise today in Eastern Europe. It is not quite the problem of the American Indian. They are a minority in the United States. They are the natives, if one may speak of any people as natives, of the United States; and the problem of protecting them is more like the problem of protecting the natives of Africa under the mandate system of the League of Nations. Nor is the problem of Eastern Europe quite like the problem of our American negro. The negroes are a minority who have been brought originally against their will into this North American continent. They are in a sense immigrants here. They are in a sense the guests of the white people in this continent. Their problem does not seem to me to be quite like the problem of those groups of the population in Eastern Europe who have lived on the soil for many generations past. Nor is it the problem of, let us say, the Irish in the United States, which is distinctly an immigrant problem, distinctly a problem of the reception by people already here of later immigrants than themselves. I think we have had only one problem of minority protection in North America which is properly comparable with the problem of minority protection in Eastern Europe, and that is the problem of protecting the Spanish inhabitants of the territory which the United States acquired from Mexico at the end of the Mexican War. There is a real simile, if one is searching for a simile; and I think it is very important that we should have some simile for America, because I have found that Americans completely misunderstand the minority question in eastern Europe as the result of their efforts to superimpose that situation on American life.

If you admit the international character of the question, I shall not attempt to trace the history of the efforts during the nineteenth century to protect the various minorities in transferred territories—the efforts of the Congress of Vienna in 1814-5, of the Congress of Paris in 1856, of the Congress of Berlin in 1878, of which Mr. Marshall has spoken, or of the congress that convened at Constantinople in 1881 concerning the transfer of Thessaly to Greece. Nor is it necessary for me to spend any time on the history of the various efforts made at Paris, which Mr. Marshall has traced so admirably. I shall perhaps pause to say that the treaty with Armenia has not come into force, and in my judgment never will come into force. There have also been several treaties in the course of the last six years which have accepted this system for various territories. For instance, the free city of Danzig accepted a policy of minority protection for the nationals of that territory. Germany and Poland put into the treaty concerning part of Silesia a provision for the protection of minorities. A similar provision was put into the treaty concerning the nationals of the Aaland Islands.

Now, the result of having these provisions is a certain inequality in international law of the state that has accepted any such obligations. I think it is a mistake to discuss this subject without mentioning that inequality, because one is not going to make progress, I believe, in dealing with the problem of minorities, unless he appreciates its very special character, and unless he appreciates the strength of the argument of the people who do not want to undertake an international obligation of this kind. There is a distinct inequality today in the position of Poland or Rumania or Czecho-Slovakia in international law, because those countries have undertaken these treaties; and they say, quite rightly enough, that the United States or Italy does not propose to undertake any treaty obligation of this kind with reference to its minorities.

There is also a dissimilarity in the position of the different states which have these obligations. In some of the states the protection of minorities is merely a matter of internal domestic policy. That would be true, for instance, in Poland or Rumania. In other states, it is not merely a matter of internal domestic

policy, but it is also a matter of foreign policy. Hungary, for example, has the problem of carrying out this minority regime with respect to the minorities in Hungary. She also has very much at heart the problem of carrying out this minority regime with respect to the non-resident Magyars. Therefore you may find a very different position taken by Poland or Rumania on the one hand, and by Hungary or Greece or Bulgaria on the other hand, and the positions of those different countries in that matter cannot be assimilated.

Of course, if an inequality of this kind prevailed in the international law of our time, there would naturally be an attempt at the equalization of the positions of the different countries in this respect. Those attempts were first made at the peace conference, when an effort was made to have Italy accept a minority treaty with respect to the territories that she was acquiring. Of course, the answer was that Italy was a great power whose history did not have within it anything that would justify her being required to give in to such a demand. An effort was later made in the Third Assembly of the League of Nations to point out this inequality, and to have it redressed in some manner, and the Third Assembly of the League of Nations in 1922 did draw up a resolution calling upon states that are not under obligations, such as those contained in the minority treaties, to give to the minorities within their own territories at least equally as good treatment as they were demanding for the minorities within the states that have accepted those obligations. In the third place, a very persistent effort was made by Lithuania at the Assembly of the League of Nations this past year to equalize the general international situation, when the Lithuanian delegate at the assembly at Geneva proposed that a universal treaty concerning the protection of minorities should be drawn up and the various powers should be asked to sign it.

Now, all those efforts at the equalization of the situation are doomed to failure. I think that failure is inevitable, because we are not dealing with a situation which will lend itself to a uniform treatment in different countries or in different parts of the world. You don't have anything like a universal political situation which would make it possible for different countries to accept the same

obligation. The impossibility of any such equalization of the treaties of different countries has been set forth better than anywhere else in the report made by Mr. de Mello Franco, delegate of Brazil on the Council of the League of Nations, December 9, 1925—and that report remains, I think, the most masterful document that has yet been drawn up on the subject. It is worthy of note, by the way, that the Brazilian delegate on the Council of the League of Nations is usually the delegate who is charged with acting as *reporteur* with respect to any minority questions.

If this is an international obligation of these governments, if it cannot be equalized, then I think that we should be pretty clear as to the nature of it. What is the nature of the international obligation? The treaty says that it is an obligation of international concern. I was very much pleased that Mr. Marshall was willing to set no limitations on that expression. Speaking in precise terms, it is very difficult for me to know just what is meant by an obligation of international concern. That is a splendid-sounding phrase, and I do not doubt that it is going to be of good service in the future, but I cannot tell exactly what it means.

In the second place, the obligation was placed under the guarantee of the League. I think Mr. Marshall did not mention to us about one point in his discussion—that the League of Nations does not guarantee to enforce the minority treaties. The treaties themselves are placed under the guarantee of the League. That expression received a certain amount of precision at the hands of the Council in a resolution of October 27, 1920, but I think it is difficult to say that the expression has a very definite content.

If it is an international obligation when one entertains its nature in general, what are the ways of having this obligation enforced? Well, before the war there was no way at all, and when Secretary Hay in 1902 protested against a violation of the treaty of Berlin of 1878, his protest was thrown into the waste basket. There was no machinery of any kind, and the treaties themselves contain a very narrow provision for their enforcement.

I noticed that Mr. Marshall hesitated at one point when he was reading the treaty, because it is hard for either him or me to believe that the treaty is quite as restrictive as it actually is, when

we come to see it on paper; that is, "A country accepting these obligations agrees that any member of the Council of the League of Nations shall have the right to bring to the attention of the Council, any infraction or any danger of infraction of any of these obligations." The American delegation to the peace conference made a very determined effort to have that read, "any member of the League of Nations shall have the right," but in that effort we were unsuccessful. There was no reason at the time for limiting it, as it is limited in the treaty, and I do not see any reason for it today. I am delighted to see that Mr. de Mello Franco, in the report of which I have spoken, says that in his judgment there is no reason for that restriction.

Resort to the Council of the League of Nations has been on the whole fairly frequent during the course of these past six years. There is a provision for resort to the Court in case of a difference of opinion between one of the states represented on the Council, and the state that has accepted these obligations. I am very much pleased to know that Mr. Marshall attaches such importance to that provision in the treaty. For myself, I attach less importance to it. I am afraid, however, that I must have overlooked something that Mr. Marshall sees in it, though I cannot see the possibility of the formulation of the differences within the text of the treaty. I think it is doubtful whether the differences between some state represented on the Council of the League of Nations, and a state which has accepted the minority obligations, will formulate a different duty delegated to a permanent court of international justice. Secretary John Hay would have been willing to go so far in 1902, but, of course, if we should ever again have a Secretary Hay in the United States, our government may not be a party to any of this regime at all. I think resort to the Council, rather than resort to the Court under the treaty itself, is what must be expected.

How can resort to the Council be made? Well, a complaint is to be lodged with the Council that the treaty itself has been violated in some way. Now, notice that that complaint is not made by one state against another state. If it were, this would be a simple matter, and the rôle of the World Court would be perfectly

clear. It is made either by a member of a minority within a country—let us say, Poland—against the Polish government, and then lodged with the Council of the League of Nations, or it may possibly be made by some international organization outside Poland against the Polish government and lodged with the Council of the League of Nations. Of course, any state that is represented on the Council of the League may bring an infraction to the attention of the Council, but no instance has occurred in the past six years in which any state represented on the Council took the initiative itself. In other words, the members of the states represented on the Council wait for the initiative to be taken by a member of the minority in Poland or by some international organization outside.

Now, I wish to have you see quite clearly that whenever a complaint is made, it is not in my judgment a judicial arraignment of Poland. It would be a mistake to call it that. It is, rather, a calling of the notice of the Council to the fact of this situation, in order that the Council may use whatever means are at its command to remedy the situation, not by adjudication, but by negotiation. It is not for the Council in those cases to speak and call Poland a culprit. No state wants to be treated in that way, and I think that any state so treated would oppose these minority treaties, and would not cooperate in carrying them out, unless the function of the Council is kept rather distinct. I insist that a complaint lodged with the Council is not an incrimination or a judicial arraignment of the state against which it is lodged, but it is there for the purpose of enabling the Council to take such steps as may seem to be wise and proper under the circumstances.

Now, what is the method of enforcement? In the first place, there is a section of the Secretariat of the League of Nations which is charged with receiving a petition which comes, let us say, from Poland. Fortunately at the head of the section is one of the greatest statesmen, I think, in Europe, a man whose name is not known in this country—Eric Colban, a Norwegian. Now, Mr. Colban will be thoroughly in touch with the situation before a petition arises; and whenever a situation arises, it is very probable that Mr. Colban will already have attempted in some way by quite informal and quite personal negotiations to have influenced legislation in

such a way as to make that petition unnecessary. Do you see what I mean? Mr. Colban is thoroughly in touch with the members of the minorities in these different countries, and if possible you may be sure that his influence has been used in advance in the framing of legislation to prevent a situation arising, in which it would be necessary for the members of that minority to petition the Council.

Suppose, though, that the preliminary efforts have been unsuccessful. It is then for the secretary of the League or the secretary general to make a decision as to the receivability of a particular petition. The first question is, is this petition receivable? Now, the Council of the League of Nations on September 5, 1923, laid down the exact requisites for the receivability of petitions. Those requisites are: The petition must relate to the minority regime in this treaty, it must not call for the severance of political ties, it must not come from an anonymous source, it must not be phrased in violent language, and it must not relate to a subject which has recently been disposed of by some other petition.

Suppose it is decided that a petition from some individual in Poland or from some group in Poland is receivable; then what is to be done? The petition will then be communicated to the government against which the petition is drawn, in order that that government may have an opportunity to say what its view on the situation is. Under the resolution of the Council of June 27, 1921, that government will be given three weeks in which to say whether it cares to make a reply, and then it will be given two months, if it cares to make a reply, in which that reply may be framed, always allowing for a special case of some urgent kind which might have to be dealt with by a different procedure, so that a certain amount of time must elapse. Then, when the government makes its reply, the original petition and the reply go before the members of the Council, instead of being distributed to the other members of the League of Nations. In the beginning, the petition was distributed to all members of the League of Nations, but that was found to be a way of advertising complaints, and that was changed several years ago.

The Council, having the petition before it in that way, appoints a committee of three to deal with the petition in the first instance.

That committee of three always consists of the acting president and two other members under the resolution of October 25, 1920. That resolution has now been changed by a resolution of June 10, 1925, safeguarding the make-up of the committee, so that no interested state may be represented on that committee.

Count Apponyi at the assembly last year, speaking for Hungary, proposed the creation of a permanent minority committee. I must say that it seems to me that that proposal is most ill-advised. I cannot imagine a better procedure than the present one being achieved by appointing a permanent committee. It is important that the personnel of this committee should change from time to time, and I cannot see that the proposition is well-advised.

That committee then makes a study of the petition and the reply of the government. It does not hear the minority; it does not hear the petitioner; it does not conduct anything like a trial. It endeavors to see whether or not it is a problem which may call for outside intervention of a very delicate character.

When the committee of three makes its report to the Council, the question is not directly before the Council within the meaning of the minority treaty itself, for it is then for some state represented on the Council to bring the matter formally before the Council, in order that the Council may act under the treaty. In fact, all of the procedure that I have been attempting to describe is an extra-treaty procedure. It is more liberal than the treaty itself; it is much more favorable to the success of the minority regime than the treaty itself. It is much more detailed, much more flexible, than anything that we could possibly have put into the treaty.

Now, suppose the question is before the Council. Then what will the Council do? In the first place, the Council must say whether an obligation of the treaty has been violated, to say it, not for the purpose of pronouncing Poland a malefactor, not for the purpose of finding some country a criminal—we don't deal with that kind of language, we don't deal with that kind of conception, in international affairs—to say it merely for the purpose of enabling some step to be taken which will give practical relief to the people who feel themselves aggrieved.

The Council usually finds that that question involves a question of law. The Council is not composed of lawyers. It has lawyers at its command in the Secretariat of the League of Nations, but it desires in some cases—it has desired in two cases—an authoritative pronouncement as to the meaning of the language in the treaty, for the purpose of seeing whether or not there has been a violation of the treaty with respect to the petition before it. It is there that the Permanent Court of International Justice comes in. I think that the Court does not come in, under that language in the treaty, very often. It may sometimes be used.

It is in the Council's power to ask for advisory opinions that the Court finds its function in connection with the protection of racial, religious, and linguistic minorities. Mr. Marshall has already called your attention to two opinions that have been handed down in such cases, both of them advisory opinions.

Now, there are some very delicate questions involved in this connection. In the first place there is this delicate question: When the Council asks the Court for an advisory opinion, must the Council be unanimous in asking? Let us say that some Hungarians in Rumania are protesting against something done by the Rumanian government. Rumania and Hungary, neither of which is represented on the Council, must sit on the Council for the purpose of handling this dispute. Must both Rumania and Hungary consent before the Council can ask for an advisory opinion of the Court? In 1923, when that question arose, my disposition was to say "Yes," and Rumania could have prevented at that time—in fact, I think it is not too strong to say that she did prevent—resort by the Council to the Court for an advisory opinion. Since the recent Mosul case, I may have to modify that somewhat, and I have a desire to modify it very much; in other words, we do not yet know whether the principle of unanimity applies when the Council makes a request for an advisory opinion from the Court. I think we must await further practice before we can tell what the answer to that question really is.

Who may make a petition to the Council? Well, I think it was going pretty far to have the recent case of the Hungarian *numerus clausus* come before the Council of the League. Do you all know

what *numerus clausus* means? The *numerus clausus* provides that no single group of the population shall have in the universities a greater percentage of the students than the percentage which it bears to the entire population. Thus, if there are ten per cent. of Jews in Hungary, then ten per cent. of the students in the universities may be Jews, and only ten per cent. That is the Hungarian *numerus clausus*. In 1921 Mr. Lucien Wolf—to whose work I want to offer the very highest tribute, because I think it would be difficult for this work to have succeeded as well as it has without him—acting on behalf of the Conjoint Foreign Committee of the Jewish Board of Deputies in London, made a protest against the Hungarian law. The Hungarian Jews seemed to be divided as to whether this protest ought to be made, or at any rate, ought to be pushed, and the Council of the League of Nations last month was in receipt of a protest by a Hungarian Jewish organization against its consideration of the protest brought by Mr. Lucien Wolf and his group against the *numerus clausus*. The Council of the League of Nations did take up that case. It has been dealing with it for the past four years. There is a case where a petition against a law on the ground that it violated a minority treaty was entertained by the Council at the instance of an international organization outside the country itself, and in this instance in spite of a protest by a certain part of the minority population involved of that country, namely, Hungary. I think it is a very striking case indeed.

What action may be taken by the Council after a violation has been found? Well, first, no formal pronouncement that Poland is in the wrong will be made. We don't do things that way in international affairs. Second, compensation may be secured for an outraged group. For instance, Rumania has just made compensation to a group of Magyar farmers during 1925. Third, the Council may seek a repeal of the national law, as in the *numerus clausus* case that I have just cited to you. The Hungarian government announces that it foresees the repeal of this law, and pending that further action of the Hungarian government, the Council has postponed any further consideration of the topic. In the fourth place, the efforts of the Council may be influential in the negotiation to

comply with the treaty, as, for instance, the treaty between Poland and Germany relating to Upper Silesia.

What is the rôle of the Court in this? I doubt if any contested cases are likely to come before the Court relating to the protection of minorities. The Court has two kinds of jurisdiction: first, contested jurisdiction—jurisdiction of any contested cases—and jurisdiction to give advisory opinions. As to contested cases, it has two kinds of jurisdiction also: voluntary jurisdiction and compulsory jurisdiction. I doubt if any cases will come before it submitted by two states both desiring an interpretation of the minority treaty. I do not see any now. Of course, it is too much to say that in the future that won't happen. Secondly, within the treaties, the Court has a certain kind of compulsory jurisdiction. This Polish-German Danzig treaty has already come before the Court for interpretation in a case that is now pending before it. The Court decided last summer that it had jurisdiction in that case. Here is a minority treaty. The Germans are protesting against the treatment of a German minority in Rumania. There is also a case before the Court by reason of the Court's having compulsory jurisdiction in contested cases under the Polish Danzig treaty. In the main, however, the Court's usefulness in this connection is to depend upon its function of advisory opinions.

I think that advisory opinions are essential to the Council's success in handling this minority system. I was delighted to hear Mr. Marshall say what he did about it tonight. In my judgment, it is rather a lamentable thing that people in the United States interested in the protection of minorities have kept quiet so much as they have during the last six or eight months during all this talk about these things. If the Jewish people in America are really interested in the protection of minorities—I don't know whether you are—but if you are, then it seems to me that it is your duty to try to see to it that this Court's jurisdiction to give advisory opinions is in no way whittled down by any such kind of reservation as is now being proposed in the United States Senate.

The advisory opinions, in my judgment, are really judicial functions. I don't know what judicial function means—people are talking about that term,—I don't know what it means, unless it

means this: that a defined question will come before a court which gives full opportunity to everybody to be heard, which conducts hearings in public, and which hands down opinions in public on any subject of judicial cognizance. That is precisely what this Court does. It is what it has done in giving all advisory opinions to date, and in my judgment it is what it will do in the future.

Senator Borah's proposition to abolish advisory opinions, if it were adopted, would deprive the World Court of fully 75 per cent. of its usefulness essential to the protection of minorities. I say to you that you cannot expect anything from the Court, unless its jurisdiction to give advisory opinions is maintained; no. If that be true, I wish very much that we could make it known to some of the people in Washington who are talking about changing the character of this Court, as they are doing today.

This effort to protect racial, religious, and linguistic minorities is a great experiment. I know of no more interesting experiment in the world of international affairs today, even if it does not mean that there will be no violation of the equality that these treaties attempt to achieve. Of course, there are going to be violations of the minority treaties, but the fact that there are violations will not mean, to my mind, that the system is not a success. It means this: that for this system to succeed, there must be an opportunity for a member of a minority within a country to make himself listened to in that country, and, if necessary, listened to in some international council outside. I believe that that opportunity has been vouchsafed to the racial, religious, and linguistic minorities of Eastern Europe; and I believe that the practice that has already grown up in these six years is such a practice as will lead us to hope that the world outside will find a way, not by force, not by violence, but by careful administrative pressure, to give relief to minorities that are really suffering.

I cannot close without saying one more word on behalf of the special interest of the Jewish people in looking for an honest and firm court of international justice, for the Jewish people have cause, as no other people that I know of have cause, to be grateful for this new method of handling international affairs. They have cause, as no other people have cause, to be grateful for the set-

ting up of the World Court, and I very much hope that every ounce of your influence will be bent in preventing the kind of changes in this system that are now being discussed in the United States Senate.

ADDRESS BY DR. ARTHUR K. KUHN

Vice-President of the American Branch of the International Law Association.

The protection of the rights of racial, linguistic and religious minorities is a problem closely allied to what is technically called the "sanction" of treaties. In plain language, the problem is one of the enforcement of rights accorded or guaranteed by clauses in a treaty or treaties passed between two or more countries. Now, there are no means of directly enforcing compacts between sovereign powers because they are themselves the source of law in the modern world. The nations therefore have been struggling for many years, and particularly since the late war, to devise means of enforcing treaty provisions without surrendering the principle of the equality of sovereign nations, and without resorting to the arbitrament of force.

The methods adopted at the Peace Conference of 1919 for providing various sanctions for treaty compacts through the League of Nations are well known. Besides the clauses of the Covenant, we also have clauses in treaties passed between the Allied Powers and the new states created in Central Europe and on the shores of the Baltic Sea and with the old Balkan states, granting minority rights. These clauses have been placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations. They partake of an international character in a wider sense, because they are no longer of interest merely to the nations which signed the treaties. Disputes may be considered by the Council, and may be referred to the International Court for judgment or for an advisory opinion.

What then has been the practice and experience of the League under these devices? At first the Council heard complaints coming directly through the Secretariat. But on October 25, 1920, special machinery was devised by which applications received by the Secretariat and approved by it as being substantial in origin and character were referred to a Committee of Three, composed of two members of the Council and its President. After investigation, the Committee of Three could lay a report upon the complaint before the Council, without incurring the displeasure of the state complained of, or as we should say technically, without being guilty of an unfriendly act (*acte peu amical*). However, in 1923, Poland and Czecho-Slovakia protested, and this procedure was abandoned in so far that the power of the Committee of Three was restricted to a report as to "whether on behalf of one or more members of the Council, it be considered necessary to draw the Council's attention to a breach, or threatened breach of the stipulations for the protection of minorities."

In other words, the presentation of the petition of a minority was again made contingent upon finding a member of the Council willing to present it. There is no regular course which a petition automatically pursues, after it has been referred to the Committee of Three for limited report. All this Committee can do is to say that the petition is receivable. If so, the state complained of must say within three weeks, whether it desires to express an opinion on the petition. If so, it has two months within which to make reply (a period which may be extended by the President of the Council). The Committee of Three then examines the petition at the same time as the reply of the state complained of, but it is not obliged to make a report to the Council on the merits of the complaint. Of course, any member of the Council, not on the Committee of Three, may bring it up. If an individual member of the Council, or if the Committee of Three determines to raise the merits of the question, then, of course, from that time on, but only then, does it become a dispute of an international character within the meaning of Article 14 of the Covenant, and may be submitted to the Permanent Court for judgment or for an advisory opinion.

Advisory opinions are not equivalent to judgments of the Court. They are intended to guide the Council of the League. And yet, barring a judgment by the Court equal to an award, or a hearing by the Council itself, or by arbitral procedure, they are the only hope of minorities to have complaints arising under the treaties, heard on the merits. It has been said that the opinion relating to the treatment of German residents in Polish territory served measurably to contribute to more peaceful conditions on the German-Polish frontier, thus making understandings like the Locarno treaties possible. The consent of the parties interested is not necessary prior to the submission for an advisory opinion. Indeed, in the German settlers' case, Germany did not consent prior to the submission. Poland withheld consent up to the last moment. The Council may ask for an advisory opinion without such consent. While this is not the procedure contemplated in the Minority Treaties, it is permitted under the Covenant and the Statute of the Court, and the advice of the Court has been accepted in all minority cases thus far submitted.

There have been serious defects urged against the procedure of the Council *before* the complaints reach the Court in any manner through the League of Nations. Even well grounded complaints may be prevented from being heard on the merits, or even from properly reaching that greater tribunal, the court of public opinion within and without the League, if the procedure is too involved or cumbersome. The complaint of a particular minority has no chance for a hearing on the merits, unless a member of the Council espouses the cause. These members represent the nations having a seat in the Council, and ordinarily no nation wishes to interpose in a dispute between another friendly nation and its subjects. In most cases, its interests are to remain neutral in such disputes. In other words, under present conditions, the considerations weighing for or against intervention to the extent of *hearing* a minority petition are entirely political, even though the *determination* of the controversy as provided by the Covenant and the various treaties is judicial.

Such a small proportion of petitions presented by minorities (e.g. from Czecho-Slovakia, Poland and Roumania) were sup-

ported for a hearing on the merits prior to 1924 that the well-known French jurist, Duparc, remarked that the privilege to petition accorded to minorities had only resulted in giving the Council of the League an opportunity at regular intervals to express its confidence in the states accused of a breach of the treaties (*Revue de droit international et de législation comparée*, 1923, p. 419).

While the rights or claims of minorities are not subject to precise definitions or codification at this stage of the world's political development, petitions should be considered upon the basis of right and justice, and not be thrust aside because of the fear of arousing the susceptibilities of the state complained of. On the other hand, it should be recognized that the protection of minorities by international action represents advanced ground in international law, and should be made use of with the greatest self-restraint.

There have been grave violations of treaty provisions complained of, especially in regard to expropriations of farm lands from racial minorities in territories assigned to the new states of Central Europe; also in regard to aggravated treatment of religious and linguistic minorities in educational institutions. A detailed report on serious violations of the rights of Lutherans, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics and Unitarians in Transylvania, now a part of Roumania, was published recently under the auspices of the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities, without expression of opinion by the Committee. The Report indicated that the treatment of Baptists and Jews also needed, and should receive, careful study.

It is not our purpose to deal with the merits of any of these minority complaints, but it is not out of place to suggest that the procedure of the League would be vastly improved (a) by giving the Committee of Three a tenure of a fixed period of say three years, instead of changing with each outgoing President of the Council: (b) by selecting the Committee in cooperation with the Assembly. Of course the Committee should not take on the characteristics of a judicial body, because that function should reside in the Court. But if the Committee is to exercise that "constant surveillance" over the execution of the minorities clauses

contemplated by the report of Signor Tittoni, adopted by the Council, October 22, 1920, it must assume a more independent character than as presently constituted. The Women's League for Peace and Freedom has requested the League of Nations to organize a permanent Minorities Commission, functioning like the Mandates Commission. The Council had this suggestion before it in December, 1925, and indeed, it seems a logical development.

Another weakness of procedure which has been urged as tending to nullify the beneficent purposes of the minorities clauses is the fact that the complaining minority is never allowed to know what reply has been given by the state complained of; nor is any report demanded from the Committee upon the examination which it has made. In this way, the matter is considered in secret, without opportunity to the interested parties to know the reasons asserted for denial of their alleged rights, without opportunity of contradicting the facts urged in defense, and without knowledge of the reason of the judgment rendered by the Committee on these facts. Surely, progress must be made to improve these conditions, if the minorities clauses are really to be made effective. Miss Kellor in her recent work "Security Against War" remarks: (Vol. 1, p. 78).

"The protection of minorities is thus no longer the concern of the whole League, but becomes a secret service for the Council. The only way information can reach the Assembly is through a special resolution passed by the Council or upon the request of the state complained against."

It has also been suggested that the minorities themselves, if properly and adequately organized, should be given direct recognition before the League or the Court. This is a suggestion which should be very carefully examined before being urged, as it involves considerable danger. Who is to determine when the minority has become autonomous? Must we not recognize the sovereignty of each state to the extent of requiring claims to be presented only through another state?

Senhor de Mello Franco of Brazil, in a recent report on minorities problems to the Council at its meeting of December, 1925, expressed the belief that this conception "would threaten the moral

ends toward which the system of protection instituted by the Minorities Treaties is tending." We are inclined to believe that he is right, and that the same results may be achieved by less radical innovations. It is interesting to observe that this proposal does not come from any religious group, but principally from states like Hungary, which find a large number of their former citizens now under a foreign domination. In recent times, Hungary has not been overly considerate of her own minorities, though we believe this may be due to her difficult political problems, and does not represent the true character of the great Hungarian people. However, it may not be out of place to say that states will be held to account in this matter hereafter and asked to do equity as a condition of seeking equity.

While we do not favor recognizing minorities as legal persons before the Council or the Court, we urge that any state, even though not represented on the Council, should have the right to take up the cause of a minority. This is a principle adopted by the United States Government at the time of the Hay Note to Rumania, protesting against the persecution of the Jews. The complaint was not based alone upon humanitarian grounds, but partly upon self-interest in defending the country from receiving an inordinate number of refugees at one time. But as the denial of justice to minorities has now been recognized as a disturbance of international peace, the basis of national interest is never lacking, because every nation is vitally interested in maintaining peace. It was upon considerations such as these that the Stockholm Conference of the International Law Association in September, 1924 (Lord Phillimore in the chair), adopted the following principle:

"Every member of the League of Nations has the right to bring before the Council a case of infraction of the rights guaranteed by the Treaties of Minority, and, in case of difference, to submit it to the decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice."

The problem of minority rights is not a Jewish question, it is an international question. The Jews will benefit with the advancement of this cause along with other minorities. The problem

should never be viewed as a special or limited one, but as part of the perfection of international organization as a whole.

This is of greater significance, because it is precisely in those countries in which other minorities are disadvantaged, that the Jews are under the greatest disabilities. Where the population is not arbitrarily divided into ethnic, religious, or linguistic groups, identified as such, the minority problem is of less importance. Where the individual is guaranteed in his legal privileges, apart from his relation to the group, there minority protection can never be a problem, except it be by action outside the law.

International law has taken a great forward step in placing the protection of minorities upon a legal basis. It will require tact and self-restraint on the one hand, and a spirit of fair play on the other, to develop a smooth-running technique which will make the guarantee effective without infringing upon the prerogatives of any just government.

JUDAEAN MEETINGS, 1918-1926

LEIPZIGER MEMORIAL EXERCISES, March 1st, 1918, Temple Emanu-El Vestry Room. Speakers: Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding; Hon. Herbert L. Bridgman, Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Joseph L. Bittenwieser, Prof. Charles P. Fagnani, Dr. George F. Kunz and Hon. Louis Marshall.

THE JEWS IN THE EUROPEAN WAR ZONE, Dec. 1, 1918, at the Hotel McAlpin. Speakers: Ambassador Abram I. Elkus, Dr. Boris D. Bogen and Dr. Jacob Kohn. Hon. Samson Lachman presiding.

MEETING IN HONOR OF PROF. THEODORE REINACH, Jan. 30, 1919. Speakers: Prof. Theodore Reinach, Dr. Max Radin, Hon. Louis Marshall and Rev. Dr. Nathan Krass; Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

MEETING IN HONOR OF THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF READING, Lord Chief Justice of England and British Ambassador and High Commissioner to the United States, April 22, 1919. Speakers: The Earl of Reading, Jacob H. Schiff, Hon. Abram I. Elkus, Julius J. Frank, Rev. Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

THE JEWS IN EASTERN EUROPE, Dec. 14, 1919. Hon. Henry Morgenthau on "Polish Jewish Conditions"; Lewis Strauss, Esq., "With Hoover in Europe—Some Reminiscences"; Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

THE TERCENTENARY OF THE LANDING OF THE PILGRIMS, Dec. 12, 1920, in conjunction with the *American Jewish Historical Society*. Speakers: Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, President of Brown University on "The Pilgrim Heritage," Hon. Oscar S. Straus, "The Pilgrim and the Hebrew Spirit," Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

PRESENT DAY CONDITIONS OF THE JEWS IN EUROPE, AS SEEN BY SOME RECENT VISITORS. Speakers: Henry Alsberg, Esq., Arthur K. Kuhn, Esq., Felix M. Warburg, Esq., Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

MEETING IN HONOR OF PROF. ISMAR ELBOGEN AND DR. FELIX PERLES, Nov. 26, 1922. Speakers: Prof. Ismar Elbogen, Dr. Felix Perles, Rev. Dr. Nathan Krass, James N. Rosenberg, Esq., and David M. Bressler, Esq.; Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

MEETING, MARCH 25, 1923, Dr. Nahum Slousch on "Some Recent Jewish Excavations in Palestine"; Elisha M. Friedman, Esq., "A Recent Visit to Palestine"; Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

MEETING IN HONOR OF DR. ISRAEL ABRAHAMS AND THE REV. DR. K. KOHLER'S 80TH BIRTHDAY, April 29, 1923, at the Hotel Astor; Dr. Israel Abrahams on "Leisure," Dr. K. Kohler on "The Lesson from Tutankh-Amon's Tomb for the Jew." Greetings, by Rev. Dr. Samuel Schulman; Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

DINNER IN HONOR OF ISRAEL ZANGWILL, Oct. 28, 1923. Speakers: Israel Zangwill, Hon. Louis Marshall, Hon. Horace Stern, and Simeon Strunsky; Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

MEETING IN HONOR OF PROF. LUDWIG STEIN, Jan. 27, 1924. Speakers: Prof. Ludwig Stein, Prof. Israel Davidson, and Rev. Dr. Nathan Stern; Max J. Kohler, presiding.

MEETING IN HONOR OF DR. JULIUS GOLDSTEIN AND DR. JULIUS GUTMANN, March 2, 1924. Speakers: Prof. Julius Goldstein on "Race and Anti-Semitism," Prof. Julius Gutmann on "The Jews as Elements in the Modern World," Max J. Kohler on "Racial Discriminations Under Our Immigration Laws and in College Quotas"; Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

MEETING OF JAN. 11, 1925. Speakers: Hon. David Yellin on "Palestine Under the Mandate." James N. Rosenberg, Esq., on "An Effort to Solve the Russian Jewish Problem in Russia"; Miss Cecilia Razovsky on "Experiences Among the Stranded Jewish Refugees in Cuba"; Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

MEETING IN HONOR OF DR. H. SLIOSBERG, April 19, 1925, Speakers: Dr. H. Sliosberg on "The Present Condition of the Jews in Russia"; Abraham Cahan, Esq., "Some Glimpses of Present Day Russia"; Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

PRESENT DAY CONDITIONS OF THE JEWS OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE, May 22, 1925. Speakers: Dr. Hermann Vogelstein, "Present Day Conditions of the Jews of Germany"; Dr. Ignatz Ziegler, "Present Day Conditions of the Jews of Czechoslovakia"; Dr. Henry Moskowitz, "Present Day Conditions of the Jews of Poland and Russia"; Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

"THE WORLD COURT AND THE PROTECTION OF RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS MINORITIES," Jan. 17, 1926. Speakers: Hon. Louis Marshall; Prof. Manley O. Hudson; Dr. Arthur K. Kuhn; Hon. Samson Lachman, presiding.

"THE POTENTIALITIES OF MOTION PICTURES—A PROGRAM OF JEWISH PERSONALITIES," Feb. 28, 1926. Speakers: Emanuel Cohen, Esq., "The World-Wide Effect of Motion Picture Journalism"; Dr. Hugo Riesenfeld on "Development and Advancement of Music in Motion Pictures"; Production of Film, "Flashes of the Past"; Hon. Bernard Edelhertz, presiding.

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I.—NAME AND PURPOSE.

SEC. 1. The JUDAEANS is an association formed for the purpose of promoting and furthering the intellectual and spiritual interests of Jews.

ARTICLE II.—OF THE OFFICERS.

SEC. 1. This Society shall be managed by a Board of Directors of nine members.

SEC. 2. The original members at the adoption of this Constitution shall be known as Founders. They shall constitute the Governing Body of the Society for the first year of its existence. One-third of their number shall retire by lot in 1898; one-third in 1899, and one-third in 1900. For the first year the Founders shall elect from their number the officers hereinafter named.

SEC. 3. Three members of the Board of Directors shall be elected at each annual meeting to serve for the term of three years.

SEC. 4. The officers of the Society shall be a president, two vice-presidents, a secretary and a treasurer, who shall be elected annually from the Board of Directors by the members of the Society, and shall hold office until their successors are chosen.

SEC. 5. The Board of Directors shall have power to fill all vacancies in its own membership, or among the officers, for unexpired terms.

ARTICLE III.—OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

SEC. 1. The Board of Directors shall have general charge of the affairs, funds and property of the Society, and shall hold regular meetings at least once a month.

SEC. 2. It shall at each annual meeting of the Society submit a report as well as a balance sheet. The annual report shall contain a review of matters germane to the objects of the Society as defined in Article I.

SEC. 3. It shall have power to remit the dues of any member for such cause and for such period as in its judgment may be deemed advisable and proper.

ARTICLE IV.—OF COMMITTEES.

SEC. 1. The Board of Directors shall act as a Committee on Admissions.

SEC. 2. There shall be a House Committee of three, appointed by the President, which shall make all necessary arrangements for the meetings of the Society, for its dinners and entertainments. The rooms occupied by the Society, either temporarily or permanently, shall be under the direct supervision of the House Committee.

SEC. 3. There shall be a Publication Committee of three, appointed by the President, which shall supervise the preparation of all printed matter which the Board of Directors shall see fit to send out.

ARTICLE V.—OF THE MEMBERS.

SEC. 1. The election of the members shall be by the unanimous vote of the Board of Directors.

SEC. 2. There shall be three classes of members, active, non-resident and honorary. Jews only shall be eligible to active and non-resident membership. No one shall be eligible to membership unless he be a man of general culture, who is engaged either in one of the recognized professions or in literature, art or science, or who is actively identified with Jewish interests, and at least three-fourths of the members of the Society shall be engaged in literature, the arts or sciences, or be members of any other recognized profession.

SEC. 3. Candidates for active or non-resident membership shall be proposed by two members of the Society, and their names sent in writing, together with those of the proposers, to the Secretary at least ten days before the date of the meeting at which they are to be acted upon. In issuing the call for the meeting of the Board of Directors, the Secretary shall enclose the names of the candidates and their proposers. Members proposing candidates for membership shall be required to accompany the proposal with a sketch of the candidate, and all applications shall be acted upon by the Board of Directors with reasonable dispatch.

SEC. 4. Persons living outside the boundaries of Greater New York, and not desiring to become active members, may be elected as non-resident members. They shall enjoy all the privileges of the Society, except the right to vote and to hold office. They shall be subject to the Constitution and By-Laws, and to all other regulations which the Society may make.

SEC. 5. The Board of Directors shall have power at all times to invite and to regulate the invitation and reception of guests of the Society.

SEC. 6. The annual dues of active members shall be five dollars, payable on the first day of May.

SEC. 7. When the dues of any member remain unpaid for three months, notice of the fact shall be mailed to him; and if such dues remain unpaid for one month after the date of his notification the Board of Directors may cause his name to be stricken from the roll of membership. The Board of Directors, however, shall have the right to reinstate such a member, stipulating whatever terms it may consider desirable.

SEC. 8. The Board of Directors may, upon written application, transfer to the class of active members any non-resident member without requiring him to pay a second entrance fee.

SEC. 9. Honorary members may be elected by the Society at its annual meeting upon the unanimous recommendation of the Board of Directors. No more than two honorary members shall be chosen in any one year.

SEC. 10. Each member may, subject to such rules as the Board of Directors may adopt from time to time, introduce friends as visitors either to the rooms occupied by the Society or to meetings (with the exception of a special business or annual meeting).

ARTICLE VI.—OF MEETINGS

SEC. 1. The annual meeting of the Society for the election of Officers and Directors, and for the transaction of other business, shall be held during the first week of May, the new officers entering upon their duties on the first day of June.

SEC. 2. Special Meetings of the Society may be called at any time by the Board of Directors, and must be called by the President at the written request of ten active members of the Society, specifying the objects of the meeting.

SEC. 3. Twelve active members of the Society shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of the Society. Five shall be a quorum of the Board of Directors.

SEC. 4. The Society shall assemble for social purposes at such times as the Board of Directors shall designate.

ARTICLE VII.—OF BY-LAWS AND AMENDMENTS.

SEC. 1. The Board of Directors may adopt, alter and amend such by-laws as it may see fit for the proper conduct of the meetings and affairs of the Society, and for the due care of its property.

SEC. 2. No alterations shall be made in this Constitution, unless the same shall be approved by a majority of the members of the Board of Directors, and ratified by the votes of two-thirds of the members present at the annual or a special meeting. Printed or written notices of any such proposed change shall be sent to members in the invitation to the meeting at which action on the proposal is to be taken.

At a meeting of the Society, held January 9th, 1912, the following resolutions were adopted:

"That in addition to the stated annual meeting of the Society, the Board of Directors shall arrange for three further informal meetings for the discussion of subjects of Jewish or kindred interests or for addresses by authoritative speakers. At these meetings there shall be read the minutes of the proceedings of the Society of its last prior meeting, together with a brief report by the Board of Directors of its transactions since the making of its last report. No person shall be asked to present a paper or formal address at more than one meeting a year."

"The Board of Directors shall arrange for such other meetings, gatherings or receptions as they may deem expedient. No refreshments at the Society's expense shall be served at the informal meetings of the Society."

THE JUDAEANS

"There have been many societies formed in our community, but none exactly like this. Unions have been formed for purely social purposes, for benevolent purposes, and for the education of others. This Society has a purpose quite different. It is to bring together those who desire, as our preamble states, to promote and further the intellectual and spiritual interest of Jews."

President's Address, Founders' Night, June 1, 1897.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

HON. SAMSON LACHMAN, *President.*

JULIUS J. FRANK.

LEWIS M. ISAACS, *Treasurer.*

MAX J. KOHLER, *Vice President.*

ARTHUR K. KUHN.

SOL. LOWENSTEIN.

DR. HENRY MOSKOWITZ.

SOL. M. STROOCK.

EDGAR J. NATHAN, JR., *Secretary,*
128 Broadway, New York City

LIST OF MEMBERS

Adler, Julius O., New York Times, 229 W. 43rd St., New York City.
Alexander, Jerome, 423 W. 120th St., New York City.
Alsberg, Henry, 56 W. 95th St., New York City.
Alzheimer, Ben, Park Chambers, 68 W. 58th St., New York City.
Arkush, Reuben, 345 W. 88th St., New York City.
Ash, Edward, 79 Wall St., New York City.
Ash, Mark, 79 Wall St., New York City.
Benjamin Eugene S., 233 Broadway, New York City.
Berg, Dr. A. A., 10 E. 73rd St., New York City.
Bernheimer, Charles L., 120 Franklin St., New York City.
Bernheimer, Dr. Charles S., 320 W. 89th St., New York City.
Bernstein, Herman, 135 W. 84th St., New York City.
Bijur, Hon. Nathan, 160 W. 75th St., New York City.
Bloch, Dr. Joshua, 476 Fifth Ave., New York City.
Bloch, Charles E., 31 W. 31st St., New York City.
Bloomfield, Meyer, 490 West End Ave., New York City.
Blumenthal, Dr. J. Leon, 348 Central Park W., New York City.
Blumenthal, Walter H., c/o American Hebrew, 19 W. 44th St., New York City.
Bondy, Hon. Wm., U. S. District Judge, 233 Broadway New York City.
Bressler, David M., 2345 Broadway, New York City.
Bullowa, Dr. Jesse G. M., 62 W. 87th St., New York City.
Burger, Dr. Leo, 1000 Park Ave., New York City.
Buttenwieser, Joseph L., 200 Fifth Ave., New York City.
Cardozo, Hon. Benjamin N., 16 W. 75th St., New York City.
Cohen, Emanuel, 74 Winter Ave., New Brighton, Staten Island, N. Y.
Cohen, Julius Henry, 111 Broadway, New York City.
Cohen, Dr. Martin, 1 W. 85th St., New York City.
Cohen, Hon. William N., 515 Park Ave., New York City.
Cohen, Rev. Simon R., 1421 Ditmas Ave., Brooklyn, New York.
Cohen, Rev. Dr. Simon, 841 W. 177th St., New York City.
Cohn, Eugene, 29 Broadway, New York City.
Corn, Joseph J., 135 Broadway, New York City.
Cowen, Philip, 520 W. 122nd St., New York City.
Davidson, Gabriel, 601 W. 177th St., New York City.
Davidson, Prof. I., 92 Morningside Ave., New York City.
Dublin, Dr. Louis I., 790 Riverside Drive, New York City.
Edelhertz, Bernard, 375 Riverside Drive, New York City.
Ehrich, Manfred W., 67 Wall St., New York City.
Eisner, Hon. Mark, 29 E. 64th St., New York City.
Elkus, Hon. Abram I., 165 Broadway, New York City.
Enelow, Rev. Dr. H. G., 521 Fifth Ave., New York City.
Fishberg, Dr. Maurice, 170 W. 59th St., New York City.
Frank, Adam, 36 W. 44th St., New York City.
Frank, Julius J., 173 Riverside Dr., New York City.

- Frankel, Dr. Lee K., 1 Madison Ave., New York City.
Frankenthaler, Hon. Alfred, 1192 Park Ave., New York City.
Frankel, Jacob M., 508 W. 139th St., New York City.
Friedenberg, Albert M., 38 Park Row, New York City.
Friedman, Dr. E. D., 1192 Park Ave., New York City.
Friedman, Dr. Elisha M., 11 Wall St. (Room 1701), New York City.
Friedman, Harry G., 24 Pine St., New York City.
Gitelson, M. Leo, 424 Broadway, New York City.
Glucksman, Harry L., 425 Riverside Dr., New York City.
Goldman, William, 58 E. 83rd St., New York City.
Goldmark, Emil, 269 W. 90th St., New York City.
Goldmark, Rubin, 140 W. 87th St., New York City.
Goldsmith, Abram, 61 Broadway, New York City.
Goldsmith, August, 33-43 Gold St., New York City.
Goldsmith, Samuel A., 385 Ft. Washington Ave., New York City.
Goldstein, Rev. Dr. Israel, 233 W. 83rd St., New York City.
Goldwasser, I. Edwin, 808 West End Ave., New York City.
Goldwater, Dr. S. S., c/o Mt. Sinai Hospital, 5th Ave. & 100th St.,
New York City.
Goodman, Seymour A., 473 West End Ave., New York City.
Gottschall, Simon, 352 Fourth Ave., New York City.
Greenbaum, Hon. Samuel, 145 W. 86th St., New York City.
Grossman, Hon. Moses H., 115 Broadway, New York City.
Grossman, Rev. Dr. R., 254 W. 82nd St., New York City.
Guiterman, Arthur, 121 Madison Ave., New York City.
Halle, Louis J., 322 W. 78th St., New York City.
Harris, Rev. Dr. M. H., 418 Central Park W., New York City.
Heinsheimer, Norbert, 165 Broadway, New York City.
Hellmann, George S., 600 Madison Ave., New York City.
Hendricks, Henry S., 140 W. 71st St., New York City.
Heymann, Everett B., 165 Broadway, New York City.
Hirsdansky, Simon, 304 W. 102nd St., New York City.
Hofheimer, Henry, 61 Broadway, New York City.
Huebsch, Benjamin W., 30 Irving Pl., New York City.
Huhner, Leon, 253 Broadway, New York City.
Huhner, Dr. Max, 316 W. 72nd St., New York City.
Hurwitz, Henry, 63 Fifth Ave., New York City.
Hyamson, Dr. Moses, 65 E. 96th St., New York City.
Hyman, Julius, 128 W. 70th St., New York City.
Illoway, Dr. H., 1113 Madison Ave., New York City.
Isaacs, Lewis M., 475 Fifth Ave., New York City.
Isaacs, Stanley M., 505 Fifth Ave., New York City.
Jarecky, Dr. Herman, 168 W. 86th St., New York City.
Joseph, Dr. Samuel, 65 W. 95th St., New York City.
Kagan, L. B., 111 Broadway, New York City.
Karpf, Maurice J., 210 W. 91st St., New York City.
Klein, Dr. Joseph J., 19 W. 44th St., New York City.

- Kohler, Edgar J., 29 W. 85th St., New York City.
Kohler, Max J., 253 Broadway, New York City.
Kohn, Rabbi Jacob, 235 W. 110th St., New York City.
Kohn, Solomon, 270 Madison Ave., New York City.
Korn, Dr. Harold, 425 Riverside Drive., New York City.
Krass, Rev. Dr. Nathan, 2370 Broadway, New York City.
Kresel, Isidor J., 49 Wall St., New York City.
Krimsky, Joseph, 263 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, New York.
Kross, Dr. Isidor, 20 W. 50th St., New York City.
Kuhn, Arthur K., 308 W. 92nd St., New York City.
Lachman, Hon. Samson, 61 Broadway, New York City.
Lamport, Samuel C., Hotel Majestic, Central Pk. W. at 72nd St., New York City.
Lande, Louis, 290 Broadway, New York City.
Landman, Rabbi Isaac, c/o American Hebrew, 19 W. 44th St., New York City.
Lauer, Hon. Edgar J., 36 Central Pk. South. New York City.
Lazansky, Hon. Edward, 133 Eighth Ave., Brooklyn, New York.
Lehman, Arthur, 16 William St., New York City.
Lehman, H. Eugene, Highland Manor, Tarrytown, New York.
Lehman, Herbert H., 16 William St., New York City.
Lehman, Hon. Irving, 37 W. 69th St., New York City.
Lewi, Isidor, 1 W. 81st St., New York City.
Levinson, Rabbi Samuel J., 83 Marlborough Rd., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Levison, Lois C., 54 E. 74th St., New York City.
Levy, Aaron William, 250 Park Ave., New York City.
Levy, Edward B., 70 E. 45th St., New York City.
Levy, I. Montefiore, 233 Broadway, New York City.
Lewisohn, Adolph, 61 Broadway, New York City.
Lewinson, Benno, 18 E. 41st St., New York City.
Liebman, Walter H., 36 W. 44th St., New York City.
Lowenstein, Solomon, 150 W. 79th St., New York City.
Mack, Hon. Julian W., 233 Broadway, New York City.
Magnes, Rev. Dr. J. L., 114 Fifth Ave., New York City.
Mannheimer, Dr. Leo, 60 W. 68th St., New York City.
Marcus, Samuel, 114 E. 90th St., New York City.
Marks, Hon. M. M., 50 E. 42nd St., New York City.
Marshall, Louis, 120 Broadway, New York City.
Mendes, Rev. Dr. H. P., 99 Central Park West., New York City.
Meyer, Dr. Alfred, 1225 Park Ave., New York City.
Meyer, Eugene, Jr., 14 Wall St., New York City.
Meyerowitz, Arthur L., 149 Broadway, New York City.
Mielziner, Leo, 47 Washington Sq., New York City.
Miller, Nathan, J., 120 Broadway, New York City.
Moisseiff, Leon S., 215 W. 101st St., New York City.
Morgenthau, Hon. Henry, 417 Park Ave., New York City.

- Moscowitz, Hon. Grover C., U. S. District Judge, P. O. Bldg., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Mosessohn, David N., 570 Seventh Ave., New York City.
- Mosessohn, M., 29 E. 32nd St., New York City.
- Moskowitz, Dr. Henry, 147 W. 94th St., New York City.
- Nathan, Edgar J., 128 Broadway, New York City.
- Nathan, Edgar J., Jr., 128 Broadway, New York City.
- Naumburg, Bernard, 36 W. 44th St., New York City.
- Necarsulmer, Edward, 507 Fifth Ave., New York City.
- Necarsulmer, Henry, 120 Broadway, New York City.
- Ochs, Adolph S., New York Times, 229 W. 43rd St., New York City.
- Oppenheim, Samuel, 811 Dawson St., Bronx, New York.
- Ottinger, Hon. Nathan, 815 Park Ave., New York City.
- Ottinger, Hon. Albert, 25 Broad St., New York City.
- Paskus, Benjamin G., 128 Broadway, New York City.
- Phillips, Nathaniel, 500 West End Ave., New York City.
- Phillips, Hon. N. Taylor, 114 W. 74th St., New York City.
- Platzek, Hon. M. Warley, 171 W. 71st St., New York City.
- Plaut, Joseph, 310 W. 86th St., New York City.
- Plaut, Leopold, 17 E. 47th St., New York City.
- Pool, Rev. Dr. David deSola, 99 Central Park W., New York City.
- Posner, Louis S., 115 Broadway, New York City.
- Proskauer, Hon. Joseph M., 205 W. 57th St., New York City.
- Raphael, Ralph H., 67 Wall St., New York City.
- Reichert, Rabbi Irving F., 107 W. 183rd St., New York City.
- Robinson, Leonard G., 97 Warren St., New York City.
- Rongy, Dr. A. J., 590 West End Ave., New York City.
- Rosenbaum, Sol G., 730 Fifth Ave., New York City.
- Rosenberg, James N., 74 Broadway, New York City.
- Rosenblatt, Dr. Frank E., 15 W. 37th St., New York City.
- Rosston, Walter J., 141 Broadway, New York City.
- Rubin, Abraham, 165 Broadway, New York City.
- Sakolski, Dr. A. M., 801 West End Ave., New York City.
- Salit, Rev. Dr. Norman, 1152 New St., Far Rockaway, New York.
- Schechter, Frank I., 350 Broadway, New York City.
- Schneiderman, H., 171 Madison Ave., New York City.
- Schulman, Rev. Dr. S., 27 W. 72nd St., New York City.
- Seligsberg, Alfred F., 15 William St., New York City.
- Sherman, Henry L., 160 Broadway, New York City.
- Sicher, Dudley D., 159 Madison Ave., New York City.
- Sicher, Dudley F., 160 Broadway, New York City.
- Sidney, Rabbi E. Charles, 951 Avenue St. John, Bronx, New York.
- Siegel, Alexander B., 25 Broad St., New York City.
- Silverman, Rev. Dr. Joseph, 55 E. 86th St., New York City.
- Simmonds, Lionel J., 1560 Amsterdam Ave., New York City.
- Solomon, Arthur L., 41 W. 83rd St., New York City.
- Sommerfield, A. W., 322 W. 72nd St., New York City.

Sondheim, Phineas, 49 Wall Street, New York City.
Speyer, Jas., 24 Pine St., New York City.
Spiegelberg, Hon. Frederick, 36 W. 76th St., New York City.
Stein, Morton, Marbridge Bldg., 34th St. & Bway., New York City.
Steinbrink, Meier, 613 Second St., Brooklyn, New York.
Stern, Leopold, 2 W. 46th St., New York City.
Stern, Rev. Dr. Nathan, 201 W. 79th St., New York City.
Stix, Sylvan L., 121 Hudson St., New York City.
Straus, H. Grant, 31 E. 72nd St., New York City.
Straus, Hon. Nathan, 119 Fifth Ave., New York City.
Straus, Nathan, Jr., 119 Fifth Ave., New York City.
Straus, Jesse Isidor, c-o R. H. Macy & Co., 34th St. & Bway., New York City.
Straus, Percy S., c/o R. H. Macy & Co., 34th St., & Bway, New York City.
Straus, Roger W., 120 Broadway, New York City.
Strauss, Lewis F., Jr., 52 William St., c/o Kuhn Loeb & Co., New York City.
Strauss, Samuel, 21 E. 82nd St., New York City.
Stroock, Moses J., 141 Broadway, New York City.
Stroock, Sol M., 141 Broadway, New York City.
Strunsky, Simeon, 309 W. 144th St., New York City.
Sulzberger, Arthur Hays, 5 E. 80th St., New York City.
Sulzberger, Cyrus L., 325 West End Ave., New York City.
Szold, Robert, 43 Exchange Pl., New York City.
Tannenbaum, Dr. Julius, 350 W. 85th St., New York City.
Taschman, Dr. Max, 119 W. 71st St., New York City.
Teller, Chester, 15 E. 10th St., New York City.
Uhry, Moise, 157 W. 79th St., New York City.
Ullman, Nathan, Apt. 15B, 145 W. 86th St., New York City.
Ulmann, Albert, 111 Broadway, New York City.
Unger, Hon. Henry W., 261 Broadway, New York City.
Vogelstein, Ludwig, 61 Broadway, New York City.
Warburg, Felix M., 52 William St., New York City.
Warburg, Paul, 17 E. 80th St., New York City.
Warner, Truly, 24 E. 42nd St., New York City.
Wasservogel, Hon. Isidor, Court Square Bldg., Centre and Pearl Sts., New York City.
Watters, Dr. Leon L., 1049 Park Ave., New York City.
Weinberger, Dr. Bernhard Wolf, 40 E. 41st St., New York City.
Weingarten, Dr. Frederick S., 310 West End Ave., New York City.
Winter, Benjamin, 250 Park Ave., New York City.
Wise Rev. Dr. Jonah B., 71 Central Park West, New York City.
Wise, Rev. Dr. S. S., 23 W. 90th St., New York City.
Wolbarst, Dr. A. L., 114 E. 61st St., New York City.
Wolf, Simson, 270 Madison Ave., New York City.
Wollman, Henry, 20 Broad St., New York City.

Non-Resident Members

- Adler, Dr. Cyrus, 2041 North Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Alschuler, Hon. Samuel, c/o P. O. Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
Amram, David W., Packard Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
Bernstein, Dr. L. B., 5704 Darlington Rd., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Billikopf, Jacob, 235 S. 15th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Bogen, Boris D., Electric Bldg., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Brandeis, Hon. Louis D., Florence Court, Washington, D. C.
Brown, David A., 1 Pershing Square, New York City.
Cohen, Rev. Dr. Henry, 1920 Broadway, Galveston, Texas.
Cohen, Dr. Solomon Solis, 1906 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Foster, Rev. Solomon, 90 Treacy Ave., Newark, N. J.
Friedenwald, Dr. Herbert, The Benedick, Washington, D. C.
Frisch, Rev. Dr. Ephraim, 1016 San Pedro Ave., San Antonio, Texas.
Gerson, Felix N., 3413 Race St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Hershfield, Isidor, 1115 Connecticut Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Hollander, Prof. J. H., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Huebsch, Dr. Daniel, 10221 Lake Shore Blvd., Cleveland, Ohio.
Margolis, Max L., Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.
Morgenstern, Dr. Julian, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Newman, Rabbi Louis I., 125 Jordan Ave., San Francisco, Calif.
Philipson, Rev. Dr. David, 3947 Beachwood Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Popper, Prof. William, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Radin, Max, 2597 Buena Vista Way, Berkeley, California.
Ranson, Rev. Marius, 206 State St., Albany, N. Y.
Rosendale, Hon. Simon W., 57 State Street, Albany, N. Y.
Rosenwald, Julius, 4901 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Schlesinger, Louis, 31 Clinton St., Newark, N. J.
Stern, Hon. Horace, 1524 N. 16th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Waldman, Morris D., 687 E. High St., Detroit, Michigan.
Zeitlin, Dr. Solomon, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.





Property of
AMBASSADOR COLLEGE LIBRARY
Pasadena, California

**PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET**

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
